

Clarence E. Wood,
 Max M. Frucht,
 Charles S. Joyce,
 Ormond L. Cox
 Royal E. Ingersoll,
 Herbert F. Leary,
 Chester W. Nimitz,
 Reuben B. Coffey,
 Joseph V. Ogan,
 Albert T. Church,
 Logan Cresap,
 John N. Ferguson,
 Louis C. Farley,
 Arthur C. Stott,
 William S. McClintic,
 Byron McCandless,
 Roscoe C. MacFall,
 Robert L. Irvine,
 Bruce L. Canaga, and
 Walter B. Woodson.
 Robert A. Barnett, Jr., to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

POSTMASTERS.

KENTUCKY.

Barbara A. Hogue, Benham.
 C. E. Barnett, Earlington.
 Sarah W. Simms, Springfield.
 Lewis P. Martin, Wayland.
 Samuel F. King, Winchester.

MINNESOTA.

Erick L. Slindee, Adams.
 Frank W. Zaffke, Backus.
 Joseph S. Stearns, Campbell.
 Charles G. Leppla, Fort Snelling.
 C. Edward Sarff, Keewatin.
 P. Andrew Bromstad, Milan.
 Walter L. O'Neill, Remer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 16, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. William Couden, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, our loving Father in Heaven, "Thou hast made us for Thyself and our souls are restless until they find their rest in Thee." Comes to us once more the fleeting, precious moment when we are wont to enter into communion with Thee through the gate of prayer. Be it for us a shelter from care and a retreat for peace, cleansing, and preparation. Banish from us our sin, our worldliness, our unbelief. Grant unto us in the stress of many conflicts and the clamor of many voices serenity of spirit and steadfastness to truth. Keep ever before us the cross of Christ, the sign of his sacrifice and triumph, the emblem of Thy love for us, the measure of our value to Thee, the symbol of our possible service to each other, and the mark of our eternal hope. And to-day and all our days, dear Lord, help us "that by the practice of those things we know to be true we may be led forward to a knowledge of those things we can not now comprehend." Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, was received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad if the House will indulge me not to exceed three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening Star of yesterday I find the following:

Chairman JOHNSON, in his policy of legislation by slander, has attempted to beat down all criticism or suggested amendment of the details of his bill by slurring sweepingly not only the Star but all Washington real estate men, representing all local landlords, and even his fellow Representatives who had the audacity to attempt to improve his bill. Of the committee representing the Real Estate Brokers' Association, Chairman JOHNSON says: "They and their clients are the profiteers."

I should apply the short and ugly word to that, Mr. Speaker, but I shall refrain from doing so, and simply say that the newspaper maliciously has garbled what I said, and has put me in a position of saying what I did not say. I did not refer in that connection to the Real Estate Brokers' Association, but instead to "real estate men" other than to that association. Further along the newspaper says:

In deprecating a hearing of the association's committee, he says: "Would the gentleman advocate giving burglars and thieves a hearing in preparing laws to stop them from their practices?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I did say will be found on page 2112 of the RECORD, and it is this:

But in this instance the Washington Star is confronted by a double question—the Government clerks upon one side, to whom it wishes to sell its papers, and the real estate men upon the other side, from whom it receives hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in the way of pay for advertisements.

Now, what I said referred to the "real estate men" and not to those of the Real Estate Brokers' Association who came to see me about the matter. Concerning the gentlemen who compose the special committee of the Real Estate Brokers' Association I have no word of criticism, but instead words of commendation. Mr. Wardman is one of those gentlemen, and never yet in any of the correspondence that has reached me, or the telephone messages, or people who have come to see me, have I heard anybody charge him for profiteering; but, on the other hand, I have heard people say that he has protested against it, and would not permit people in his apartments to do so. Of Mr. Fairfax I have never heard any criticism. I never heard a word against Mr. Story. On the other hand, I have heard words of praise of him.

If the Star or anybody else has so distorted my remarks or has misunderstood my remarks as reflecting upon any of these gentlemen, I regret it exceedingly. If I have been so unfortunate as to have my remarks susceptible to that sort of construction, I regret that. If, in the excitement of debate, I have said anything reflecting on these gentlemen, I certainly am most sorry for it and apologize to them for it.

Now, there is another place, on page 2124 of the RECORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] was saying:

Now, Mr. Chairman, only one word in closing, and that is this, that the minority of the Committee on the District of Columbia are as sincerely desirous of stopping unfair profiteering in the District of Columbia, or in any other part of the United States, as the majority, or the honorable Representative from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]; but they do not want to pass a bill which they believe is not only unconstitutional, in at least one of its phases, but unworkable, and which will not produce the results which are believed by both sides to be desirable. If therefore believe that one of three courses should be followed in relation to this bill: As no hearings were given and only an hour and a half given to the consideration by the committee, it should be referred back to the committee for reformation, or—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Would the gentleman advocate giving burglars and thieves a hearing in preparing laws to stop them from their practices?

There I was simply inquiring whether or not the gentleman would be willing to go beyond the Real Estate Brokers' Association in the hearings, or whether he would consent to let the profiteers come there and take up the time and delay the hearings on the bill. I meant nothing more than that. And yet the Evening Star, in its ugliness, has put me in the attitude of applying that language to the Real Estate Brokers' Association, when I never intended to do so, and the writer of that article knew, when he garbled what I said, that he was doing so for the purpose of misrepresenting me.

NOTIFICATION OF ILLNESS OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 228, to provide notification of illness of soldiers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 228, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in all cases where an enlisted man or officer of the United States Army is admitted to an Army hospital in continental America on account of a dangerous injury or disease, and in all cases of admission for slight illness or injury and the same becomes dangerous after such admission, immediate notice shall be given to the nearest relative of such enlisted man or officer under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I understood the reporting of the resolution—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right to object.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). The Clerk read the committee amendment instead of the original resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained, in view of the necessity of getting through with the deficiency appropriation bill to object to the consideration of such matters at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; it is because I do not want to take time that I am objecting, not because I am hostile to what the gentleman desires.

Mr. REAVIS. If there was any intention of time being taken on the resolution—

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. The Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. The Doorkeeper will close the doors.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Drukker	Jones, Tex.	Sabath
Austin	Dyer	Kahn	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Egan	Kennedy, Iowa	Sanders, La.
Beakes	Edmonds	Kettner	Schall
Beshlin	Estopinal	Kless, Pa.	Scott, Mich.
Black	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Bowers	Farr	Linthicum	Scully
Britten	Fess	Lobeck	Siegel
Brodbeck	Flynn	McCormick	Sims
Browning	Francis	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, T. F.
Brumbaugh	Glass	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Burroughs	Gould	Maher	Sterling, Ill.
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Strong
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray, Ala.	Meeker	Sullivan
Cantrill	Gray, N. J.	Miller, Minn.	Swift
Capstick	Greene, Mass.	Morin	Talbott
Caraway	Griest	Mudd	Templeton
Carew	Harrison, Va.	Neely	Vare
Church	Hastings	Nelson	Ward
Clark, Pa.	Heaton	Nicholls, S. C.	Wason
Coady	Heintz	Nichols, Mich.	Webb
Cooper, Ohio	Hensley	Parker, N. Y.	Wheeler
Costello	Hollingsworth	Platt	White, Me.
Cox	Hood	Riordan	Wilson, La.
Curry, Cal.	Hull, Iowa	Rosenberg	Winslow
Dallinger	Husted	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Davidson	Hutchinson	Rouse	
Doelling	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rowland	

The SPEAKER. On this call 319 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. FERRIS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes in reference to a personal matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, on what subject?

Mr. FERRIS. I want to make some remarks upon the gentleman's speech of yesterday concerning myself.

Mr. GILLETT. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I hope that the other side will be as liberal on similar occasions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire simply to say that the gentleman has the right to take the floor as a matter of personal privilege, and, wanting to expedite the consideration of the deficiency bill, I believe this is the best way to do it.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what right he has as a matter of personal privilege?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think clearly under the precedents there is enough there to take at least 20 minutes' time in argument.

Mr. GILLETT. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman should have the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am not ordinarily thin skinned, and I am not thin skinned now. I have a consciousness that I did no wrong in inserting that article, and I have it now.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], the leader on the Republican side, thinks that I made an error in incorporating an editorial in the RECORD of February 4, it being a signed editorial by ex-Gov. Martin H. Glynn, of New York. It was not a fugitive article at all; it was signed at both ends. The headline said it was an editorial by Martin H. Glynn, and it was signed by him at the bottom. That brings the issue squarely. I think I made no mistake. The gentleman thinks I did. I ask that the Clerk, in my time, read the editorial, and then the House can see who is right and who is wrong about it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, that editorial has been printed in the RECORD once, and I ask whether it is fair to have it printed again in this manner?

Mr. FERRIS. It is the only way that we can arrive at what is right and what is wrong. The gentleman says I inserted it wrongfully.

Mr. GILLETT. I said it was objectionable.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman said more than that.

Mr. GILLETT. I should like to know what I said.

Mr. FERRIS. I am very fond of the gentleman, and he has been liberal and generous to the House and he has not been overly partisan unless this is evidence of it, and I think the gentleman will do me the fairness to say that I have not been.

Mr. GILLETT. I agree to that.

Mr. FERRIS. I have as many friends on the Republican side as on the Democratic side, and I am not dealing in petty matters.

Mr. GILLETT. I simply wish to say that I was sorry yesterday to feel obliged to say what I did about the gentleman.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us have the article and we will see who is right.

Mr. GILLETT. I shall not object.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, what is the article that is to be read? The same one—

The SPEAKER. The article is an editorial or a circular letter, or something of the sort, written by ex-Gov. Glynn, of New York.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is already in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that perfectly well.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If it is already in the RECORD, I object.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman can not object; it is in my own time, and I will not yield further.

Mr. WALSH. He can object.

Mr. FERRIS. I will read it myself.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object to that.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman can not object to that.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. That under the rules of the House the gentleman can not read an article written by somebody else in his own time, if objection is made to it.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think that objection is well taken and I do not yield.

Mr. WALSH. I cite Rule XXX.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order the gentleman from Oklahoma is reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Everybody knows that.

Mr. WALSH. Section 891, Mr. Speaker, on page 423—

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this taken out of my time.

The SPEAKER. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time. Will the gentleman cite his authority?

Mr. WALSH. It is a note under Rule XXX.

The reading of papers other than the one on which the vote is about to be taken is usually permitted without question (citing Hinds' Precedents, vol. 5, 5258) and a Member in debate usually reads or has read such papers as he pleases, but this privilege is subject to the authority of the House if another Member objects.

The SPEAKER. On what page is that language?

Mr. WALSH. Section 891.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows, but what part of the page?

Mr. WALSH. It is a foot note of this section 891, at the beginning of the paragraph of section 891. It further says:

This principle applies even to the Member's own written speech or a report which he proposes to have read in his own time or to read in his place.

I submit, now, that if objection is made—

The SPEAKER. The question is to be decided by vote of the House without debate whether this paper be read or not. Shall it be read?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GILLETT. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 137, noes 101.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the article.

The Clerk began the reading of the article.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want my request read, too, so it will show all the proceedings that there occurred.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS extended his remarks by inserting the following:

IT BECOMETH AND BEHOOVETH MR. WADSWORTH, MR. LODGE, MR. CHAMBERLAIN, MR. ROOSEVELT, AND ALL THEIR PHONOGRAPHIC CULT TO CHIRP LIKE A CRICKET, NOT ROAR LIKE A LION.

[An editorial by former Gov. Martin H. Glynn, of New York, in the Times-Union, Albany, N. Y., Jan. 28, 1918.]

To-day the people of this country can be divided into two camps.

Those who wanted war at any price.

And those who hoped for peace, if peace could be maintained without the sacrifice of national honor.

Now, we are at war and we have the astonishing anomaly of the leaders of the "war buzzards" trying to gnaw the vitals out of our Commander in Chief, while the great majority of those who stood for peace while peace spelled honor are upholding the President's hands as Aaron and Hur upheld the hands of Moses in his battle with Amalek.

The present volcanic attack against the war policies of President Wilson is no haphazard incident. It is a well-laid plot, nicely trained and strategically timed. Its purpose, no matter how secretive its sponsors, how insinuating its methods, how seductive its arguments, is to give the Republican Party a majority in the next House of Representatives and to pave the way for a Republican President in 1920. From a political point of view this may be tolerable; from a patriotic aspect, in a national crisis like this, it is odious and detestable.

The business of the Nation to-day is to win the war, and the political leaders, who for party gain or personal aim lay the slightest obstacle in the way of the happy consummation of this business, clothe themselves in a diabolical livery and surround their political machinations with a brimstone scent, a sulphurous odor offensive to the people who revere patriotism in politics but abhor politics in patriotism.

For months Col. Roosevelt has been injecting politics into the war through his articles in the Kansas City Star and Metropolitan Magazine. With craft and caution he has planted a bomb, intended to blow President Wilson out of political existence, and in this "Guy Fawkes" plot he has had the unctuous assistance of Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, and the crafty support of Senator Wadsworth, of New York. But cunning and unctuousness can not win a contest like this. The mountain of truth is too big to be discolored by such daubing brushes; the facts too potent to be minimized by impish dissimulation or distorted by cunning castigation.

The Bible says he who draws the sword shall perish by the sword. Well, Roosevelt and his followers first drew the political sword in this dispute, and with their assumptive valor they should not cry for quarter before the blade of their own rapier.

For 16 years before the present Democratic administration the Republican Party was the custodian of the welfare of this Nation, and in all these 16 years it did but little to put this country on a basis of adequate preparation for war. Grover Cleveland started the American Navy on its way to imperial strength, but Theodore Roosevelt, as President of the United States, inaugurated a naval program that curtailed the Cleveland policy. Great as our Navy is to-day, it would be far greater still if the policy of Cleveland had prevailed and the plans of Roosevelt buried in the bottom of the sea. And as it was with the Navy, so was it with the Army, for Theodore Roosevelt left the Army of the United States weaker than he had found it seven years before.

No sooner, however, had Woodrow Wilson, with his panoramic view of the history of the world in peace time and in war time, his thorough knowledge of Democratic aspirations and economic possibilities, his sympathy with the masses and his consideration of the classes—no sooner had he become President of the United States than the wheels of progress were set in motion to equip this Nation as years before she should have been equipped for the solution of pressing national problems and the handling of contingencies of an international nature.

The rehearsal of all the legislation of President Wilson to carry out this progressive program would be superfluous here. The world knows it by heart. It insures him a splendid place in the annals of statesmanship. It is the unmistakable triumph of the democratic yearning with which the heart of mankind throbs and pulses to-day. And it carried Woodrow Wilson to wonderful victory in 1916 against an avalanche of money and a labyrinth of intrigue.

[Laughter on Republican side.]

His Federal reserve-bank law, which Mulhall, the famous English economist, said was of more worth to the world than the Panama Canal, saved this country, with the advent of the war, from the most stupendous panic in history and enabled us to ride the tumultuous waters of "world-war" finance with hardly a squeak or a tremor of our old ship of state. Without this Federal reserve bank to-day the United States would be grinding and pounding on the rocks of disaster. Nor is this all.

From a vision almost prophetic came the Federal revenue bill which wrung a lordly portion of governmental revenue from internal taxes instead of from tariff imposts which under the baneful influence of war dwindled to a sum insufficient to provide lubrication for our gears of Government, let alone provide fuel for the Treasury boiler that makes the wheels of national life go round.

Our national experience since the war started must carry conviction to every fair-minded American that for these two measures alone we owe an ineffable debt of gratitude to the wisdom and statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson.

And of our military realm we have the self-same tale.

Theodore Roosevelt may indulge himself in all the weird juggling of language that pleases his fancy; he may insensate himself in such inspirational riot of emotional frenzy as may give fire to his tongue and flare to his imagination; but the fact remains undeniable, ineffaceable, irremovable, that in two years of ante bellum days Woodrow Wilson

did more to put our Army and our Navy on a footing of war than both William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt did in the whole 11 years of their supine reign.

[Laughter on Republican side.]

During these two years preparedness for a possible war was pushed by President Wilson as fast as the sentiment of the country would permit and quite as fast as even the most violent of his present-day critics then deemed expedient or politic.

Suddenly, however, conditions created by the autocratic dogmatism of Germany disregarding treaties and throwing promises to the winds, hurled us into the seething whirlpool of war. Then the very men who had been at the helm of the ship of state for 16 years, the men whose policies had weakened the Army and stunted the Navy, began to howl because we could not equip a million men overnight and put them in the trenches of France in a day. They forgot the experience of England; they forgot the experience of France; they forgot their own neglect of our martial strength; they forgot everything but their own personal advertisement and their own political advancement.

Mythology tells us that Minerva sprang full-armed from the mind of Jupiter, and despite the fact that the age for mythological miracles has passed, these acrimonious critics demanded that the United States whistle rifles out of the air and by some sort of prestidigitatorial art transform a million civilians into full-trained soldiers between the sinking and the rising of the sun. What these critics had failed to do in 16 years, they insist that Woodrow Wilson should do in 16 days. The wind listeth in the night, the dew falls, the stars come out, the moon works her magic charm, and behold at dawn a full-grown mushroom whitens the lawn where at sunset only an embryonic stalk snuggled in the grass. This is the kind of marvel, this the kind of impossible legerdemain that Col. Roosevelt and his school demand should be duplicated in our military world. They demand that an invincible Army be created overnight out of wind and dew, starlight and moonshine. But they fail to provide the Aladdin's lamp with which to work the miracle; they fail to furnish the necromantic art wherewith to ram into a night the task of a decade.

And this miracle, too, they demand in the teeth of the hoary-headed truth that from the days of Washington, Franklin, and Adams this Nation has set its face against a militaristic policy. A large Army, a potential Military Establishment, has been the ghost that has given this country sleepless nights for 140 years—a factitious ghost, perhaps; but nevertheless a ghost hypnotic in its influence and awesome in its sway. And the Navy, too, has been hampered by a short-sighted sentiment of the great interior part of the country whose congressional Representatives persistently opposed large naval appropriations from fear of retrenchment against the "home-town" projects of their own native heaths. For this ingrained repugnance to a big Army, an adequate Navy, neither the Republicans of to-day or the Democrats of to-day are to blame. The fault lies at the door of the predominant sentiment of the Nation since 1776. And as we have sown; so to-day we reap.

Gen. Winfield Scott, one of the world's greatest soldiers, compressed an historic situation in a nutshell when he said, "Republics are never prepared for war."

The business of Republics is peace; the business of autocracies is war. Autocracy lives by the sword. The father and grandfather of Frederick the Great said so; Frederick himself said so; and so saith the Kaiser, and the Crown Prince, too.

A love and a craving for peace, however, form the very genesis of a republic. To this genesis republics are true; from this genesis republics depart only at the call of honor or the command of necessity.

Hence it is, though critics may forget, the people remember, that in eight months of war the United States, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, has done twice as much, and even more, than England and France did in the corresponding period of time. The accusations, the exaggerations, the fabrications, the distortions of supercilious censors and envious-fanged contemners of the Wilsonian policies wear such a flimsy gossamer covering as to expose this political plot in all its naked hideousness.

We make no claim that the administration has created sunbeams out of cucumbers or performed feats beyond the pale of human possibility, but we do maintain that its efforts have been amazing, its accomplishments beyond compare in the history of modern warfare.

We have not whipped the Kaiser yet, but we will whip him if calumniating critics do not dampen the fires of enthusiasm or grease the tracks whereon must ride our national chariots of war. We have more men in France to-day than Roosevelt knows or Germany suspects, and a million more are waiting for the ships.

We have an Army so well cared for that the death rate in our ranks for the four months ending January 1, 1918, averaged only 7.5 per thousand—a death rate, mind you, less than the death rate for men of a like age in peaceful vocations at home. Compare this with the death rate of 20.14 per thousand under the good old Republican rule of the days of the Spanish-American War. Compare these figures, and then applaud the Roosevelt charges if you can!

True, we have made some mistakes, but in the magnitude of our undertaking some mistakes were inevitable, unavoidable. In balance though with the wondrous achievements these mistakes have been trivial and not worthy of the attention of the men who minimize their talents by trying to magnify molehills into mountains.

And furthermore, unlike the Spanish-American War, in which Mr. Roosevelt was a king-pin:

We have no Army contract scandals.

We have no embalmed-beef horrors.

[Laughter on Republican side.]

We have no fat old generals going to war in carriages and leading battle charges from easy rocking chairs.

We have no unpleasant gossip about the appointment of political generals and society admirals.

[Laughter on Republican side.]

We have no round-robin letters from presumptuous and inferior officers demoralizing discipline and exalting self.

In the face of these facts the wild rantings of Roosevelt and his fellow political conspirators are boomerangs, pestilential to the ears and revolting to the sensibilities of others, but harmful only to the men who hurl them. On the estimation of thoughtful people these critics make no indelible impression. They may ruffle the surface of the pool of comment, but they stir not the depths of public opinion. And with Roosevelt, Lodge, and Wadsworth as the chief creators of this curtain of camouflage political fire, fed by the tissues of ambitious misrepresentation, fanned by the sinister winds of political oratory, there stalks

forth from memory's closet the skeleton of Alger's embalmed beef with its concomitant stench; there looms into view the commander of the United States forces in Cuba, too fat to ride a horse, going into battle in a carriage, and lolloping in a portable bathtub while our soldiers had no medicines to conquer tropic ills; there looms into view this self-same commander of the United States forces in Cuba fighting his battles from the sensuous folds of a soporific hammock, while through the stupidity and carelessness of an inefficient military medical force our soldier boys found typhoid fever more deadly than bullets from the Spanish guns.

And so, in view of these verities which no political manipulation can snatch from history's page; in view of the official funeral-hued glories and the official scarlet-tinged scandals of the Spanish-American War; in view of Alger's embalmed beef of odoriferous memory; in view of inferior ships purchased by the Government at superior prices; in view of the stigma and disgrace that typhoid fever killed more of our soldiers than Spanish bullets sent to their graves; in view of the cable which Dewey cut to save the Navy from the malefic influence of Republican politics at Washington; in view of Army contracts which brought a blush to the cheek and rage to the heart of the Nation; in view of the attempt to deprive Schley of his share of glory in the Santiago victory; in view of the papier-mâché generals created as a sort of "iron-cross" reward for services rendered the good old Republican Party on many a bloodless field of politics; in view, in fine, of the bathos and the pathos of flagrant Republican mismanagement in the Spanish-American War, it becometh and behooveth Mr. Wadsworth, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Roosevelt, and all their phonographic cult to chirp like a cricket, not roar like a lion.

MARTIN H. GLYNN.

[Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not yield, and I want to say two or three words—

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not addressing the gentleman.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is using my time.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman had 20 minutes and the gentleman has used 23 minutes in reading the article, according to the clock. I do not object to the gentleman's having all the time he wants, but he has used 23 minutes in reading the article.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman has forgotten that there was some time consumed outside of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was a certain amount of time taken in a wrangle that has to be deducted from the accurate time.

Mr. FORDNEY. But, Mr. Speaker, that time was not consumed out of any portion of the 23 minutes that the Clerk consumed in reading the article. I do not object to giving the gentleman all the time he wants, but 23 minutes was consumed in reading the article by the Clerk, according to the clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has three minutes remaining.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I did not keep the time, and I assume the Chair kept the time correctly, as he always does. I want to say that on February 4, in the regular way, standing right over there, after speaking to the leader of my party on my side about it, I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks, which was granted, by printing that article. Now, that is a partisan article, of course—

SEVERAL MEMBERS (on the Republican side). Oh, no!

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, well, I did not expect the Republican side to approve of what I am saying; neither did I expect them to approve that article.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not. From the plaudits or jeers made to the article, I do not expect to have their approval.

I am merely trying to state the history. I asked it in the usual way; it was carried in the usual way. I handed it to the Clerk in the usual way, and it was printed in the usual way, and I am very sorry that the Republican Party are getting so thin-skinned that they can not admit of an article printed as an editorial, not a fugitive article, but a signed article, by the ex-governor of the Empire State of the Republic, who has been a Member of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I stated yesterday, and I repeat to-day, that I regretted very much to offer any criticism of the gentleman from Oklahoma, whom I have always respected. The criticism I made, and which he has not in the slightest answered, was that in this branch of Congress, where both sides of the

House have during this war absolutely, so far as I know, ignored politics, have tried to put aside partisanship, and have by their speeches and their actions worked together, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] for the first time printed an article which I do not believe any man on that side would have gotten up and read as his own, and thus for the first time he projected partisanship into the proceedings of this House. That was what I objected to in the matter. I said as an editorial it was all right, but as a speech on this floor I thought it was objectionable.

The gentleman has not been quite candid with the House in what he has just said.

Mr. FERRIS. State where I am uncandid.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman says that he asked in the ordinary way. The gentleman first got up a few days before he finally received permission to print and asked permission to extend his remarks in the Record. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], reserving the point of order, asked him on what subject, and the gentleman said:

I want to print a short editorial on the war—peace and against war.

You gentlemen have heard the "short" editorial.

Mr. FERRIS. That was several days prior.

Mr. GILLET. Exactly. It was the same editorial, was it not?

Mr. FERRIS. It was the same editorial.

Mr. GILLET. And, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was refused consent to print that "short" editorial on "Peace and against war." Then, a few days later, after he had discussed a question before this House, he got up, when the House was about to adjourn, and asked unanimous consent again.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman certainly does not want to do an unkind thing. He is the leader of too great a party to do that.

Mr. GILLET. I want to present the facts fairly to the House.

Mr. FERRIS. I have the Record right here. I had made no speech of any sort, except to help get through some little bills from the Public Lands Committee two or three hours prior to that.

Mr. GILLET. It may have been; but it was that afternoon.

Mr. FERRIS. How can the gentleman attach any importance or any relation to a general request to extend remarks? It had no relation in my mind or in fact. There were three or four hours between the request and when I had said a word. It was not a set speech in any sense. I was helping to get through some little bills.

Mr. GILLET. If the gentleman says he did not think of it, I acquit him of it.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. GILLET. As you all know, on this side of the House it has been the custom that objection is made unless we know of the subject; but you know, when a man has been making a speech, even if it was delivered before the House an hour before, it is customary to assume that the gentleman is seeking to extend his remarks on that speech, and, I venture to say, that was the reason no objection was made.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. I read the gentleman's remarks, and he is repeating what he said in his speech, that I had made anything like a speech—

Mr. GILLET. You did.

Mr. FERRIS. No; I did not. I replied only to some remarks about some Oregon bill. I had no interest in it, except getting through some little bills from my committee. What the gentleman says might be true if I had really made a speech, but I did not want to make any remarks on those little bills. I cared nothing about them. I was merely answering questions and making a few short statements to help others with their bills.

Mr. GILLET. I acquit the gentleman from any purpose of intent to deceive the House, but I do think that was what prevented this House from objecting. I wish to ask the gentleman if he considers that a short editorial, and if he considers "Peace against war" a fair description of it?

Mr. FERRIS. Let me read. The facts do not hurt anybody. I will just say, in a word, if it came from anybody else but the gentleman I would not have paid any attention to it. I do not want to be considered thin-skinned about these matters. I have such regard for the gentleman that a statement like his speech yesterday really touched me a little, and I think I am justified in consuming a few moments of time.

Mr. GILLET. Certainly; and I wish to give the gentleman an opportunity.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman goes back and finds where on February 1 I asked unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Massachusetts may have five minutes more. I used some of his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. The first time I asked this permission was, on page 1692 of the Record, on February 1, just before the adjournment. This is what I said:

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject?

He objects to all extensions of remarks.

Mr. GILLETT. He objects to extensions and putting in extraneous matter. That is not a fair statement. He does not object to all.

Mr. FERRIS. I read further:

Mr. FERRIS. I want to print a short editorial on the war—peace and against war.

There is a dash there, after "war." Then, after that, it says "peace and against war." I do not recall saying the last, although I may have said it. But that editorial is on the war. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman think that that is a fair characterization?

Mr. FERRIS. It is what you are trying to forget, I expect. That is all in that place there. Now, three or four days later, on February 4, just before adjournment and after the day's proceedings had expired, this happened:

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

There is nothing clandestine and nothing mysterious about that. It is simply the usual course; nothing more, nothing less. I read further:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS extended his remarks by inserting the following.

I did not even express approval or disapproval of the article, so that I can not understand why the gentleman should object. [Laughter.] I could express approval in part now. In the midst of jeers over there I will do it.

Mr. GILLETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit it to the candid judgment of this House—to that side of the House as well as this side of the House—whether it was candid on the part of the gentleman. And, by the way, I have now been shown the remarks which the gentleman made on that day, which consumed nearly a column of the Record, which he thought amounted to so little.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no; it is not a column.

Mr. GILLETT. It is more than half a column of the Record on that same day when the gentleman made the request and it was granted.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is not fair in that assumption or right in the facts.

Mr. GILLETT. There it is, on page 1674.

Mr. FERRIS. On a bill from my committee, responding to a criticism by Dr. FOSTER, two or three hours before this request was made.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is mistaken on that. On page 1674 that appears, and he made his request on page 1678.

Mr. FERRIS. There are five pages intervening.

Mr. GILLETT. Four or five pages. Now, as to these details, Mr. Speaker, I think the House is fully master of the situation, and therefore I submit—

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. GILLETT. I submit it to the candid judgment of both sides of the House whether that was not an objectionable editorial, and whether the gentleman's manner in making the request for the publication of "a short editorial on peace and war" was fair and candid to this House. [Applause.]

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consid-

eration of the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9867, the urgent deficiency bill. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buildings: For repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds and for repairing and renewing heating, plumbing, and ventilating apparatus, and installation of sanitary drinking fountains in buildings not supplied with same, \$20,000.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether these increased expenses in the public schools were brought about by the increased number of pupils, caused by the increased number of the floating population in Washington?

Mr. SHERLEY. There were a couple of items, generally speaking, in which that was a factor. The one that has just been read grew out of the extra cost of the repairs that had been authorized.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. There were a number of items grouped together in large sums.

Mr. SHERLEY. A good deal of that was due to fuel. The increased cost of fuel and the increased amount of fuel has greatly increased the expense of running the schools.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Is there any rule or restriction as to a boy or girl attending the schools? Must they reside here a certain number of weeks?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a rule or provision of law against attendance unless pupils are residents for a certain number of weeks, but we did not go into that.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I was wondering whether it was on account of the increase of pupils.

Mr. SHERLEY. That was the case in a number of items—one or two of them—but, broadly speaking, that was not a determining factor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barracks and quarters, seacoast defenses: For construction of temporary barracks and quarters at seacoast posts for the accommodation of officers and enlisted men of the Coast Artillery, including heating and lighting apparatus, water and sewer systems, plumbing, roads, walks, wharves, and drainage, \$3,565,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in reference to this item and various other items throughout the bill for construction purposes I would like to make some inquiry as to whether the committee has any information regarding the methods under which those contracts for construction have been let. This matter has been called to my attention in correspondence, as it has been called to the attention of all. I think, in the press, that the large plants are being constructed principally by a few large contractors. The method is on the cost-plus principle, which, as I understand from builders, is the simplest in the world and the easiest to make money out of, in that the contractor himself takes absolutely no responsibility. There is a limit, of course, in the construction of the cantonments as to the amount the contractor should make out of one job, but if you follow the line of those various contracts it appears that comparatively few contractors have these jobs, in spite of the large number of buildings recently constructed.

I am credibly informed that even concerns are granted contracts that did not exist at the time of making the contract and go so far as to organize after the contract is let to a few individuals. At the present time nearly all construction throughout the country is stopped other than for governmental purposes. Where we find that formerly a large number of bids were offered in competition for contracts those concerns have practically been put out of business by the fact that all interest centers on Government construction.

Now, it seems to me that, in fairness to the maintenance of business arrangements throughout the country, these other concerns—I believe possibly not as large as those to whom the contracts have been let, yet nevertheless fully capable of carrying on such work as the construction of these temporary buildings—ought to have a chance.

Therefore I would like to know under what supervision those contracts are let, what the conditions are, who controls them, and why the smaller bidder does not have the same opportunity to get contracts under this cost-plus method as some of the largest concerns. You can probably count on the fingers of one

hand the actual concerns doing the business. They may do it under some subsidiary company and get a different title, but nevertheless there are few very large corporations with great financial backing that are actually controlling this rapid construction on the part of the Government. Therefore I think it perfectly right and proper that the committee should have some information as to who actually lets these contracts. I have known of men coming here trying to get information about specifications, and they have been shuffled around from one board to another, from one place to another, from one man to another, without meeting anyone in a responsible position who would actually give them the desired information. I am not offering this in the line of criticism, but I do think it is a matter on which we ought to have information.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no difficulty about the gentleman or anybody else having the information who takes the trouble to read the hearings previously had and printed and the present printed hearings. There has been much talk and much misinformation and much criticism with little reason about the waste and cost and excessive profits that have been made in connection with the building of cantonments.

The gentleman will find on pages 474 and 475 of the hearings tables setting out the exact amount of money paid to contractors for building the various cantonments and camps. You will find in the hearings of last fall the exact form in detail of the contract under which the work was performed. You will find that for the cantonments the percentage of fee paid runs all the way from 3.67 per cent, which I think is the maximum, to 2.20, which I believe is the minimum, an average of 2.84 per cent for the cantonments. For the camps the average was 6.88. For embarkation camps it was 3.11, 4.07, 6, 7.06, and 7 per cent. No contractor for any work received a fee in excess of \$250,000.

Now, I have no doubt it is true that there have been a limited number of contractors, though the number is very much greater than three or four or five, which would be what you could count on one hand, and the reason for that is perfectly patent. The doing of this work was more important than the distributing of it among our various constituents. It was infinitely more important to get the work done than that contractors located here, there, or elsewhere should get the job; and men charged with the responsibility of getting work of great magnitude done within a very restricted time would naturally turn to and seek out those men of sufficient magnitude and reputation to be a guarantee of the work being done, men who had existing organizations capable of being expanded quickly to take care of this character of work. The fact that the work has been done in the time in which it has been done is pretty good evidence of the wisdom of that policy. This, I think, is likely to be true touching the new work, that where the department has found a contractor who has made good, who has done work promptly, efficiently, and economically, the natural inclination will be to give that man, with a going organization, contracts for doing work of the same type, rather than to go through the process of educating a new contractor and a new organization.

The gentleman asked about 18 questions in five minutes and I am trying to cover them in five minutes. The contracts are let through the Quartermaster's Department, and the construction has been under the direct charge of former Col. Littell, now Gen. Littell, of the United States Army. He has been advised from time to time—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman state the personnel of those who let the contracts?

Mr. SHERLEY. The man who is responsible is Gen. Littell.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is he the person who lets the contracts?

Mr. SHERLEY. He is, as I understand it; but he has been advised in the past by a subsidiary committee under the Council of National Defense. I can not state from memory, but the gentleman will find in the hearings of last fall a full statement as to that fact.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is an independent committee outside of the War Department?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; it is not an independent committee outside of the War Department. It is a committee under the Council of National Defense.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is what I meant.

Mr. SHERLEY. But there are representatives of the War Department on that committee as I recall.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What I wanted to get was the personnel of the board which lets the contracts.

Mr. SHERLEY. All of that was gone into at great length last year, because there was a great deal of criticism about it, and the statements were made that contractors were going to

make exorbitant profits, and among other things the statement was made that it was excessive to pay 10 per cent, and the assumption was that 10 per cent would be the amount. In point of fact in connection with the cantonments, which constituted the big work, the percentage on the average was less than 3 per cent, and I doubt if work has ever been done anywhere of that magnitude on a percentage basis lower than what is shown to have been the actual result in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Debate on this motion under the rules of the committee has been exhausted.

Mr. TREADWAY. I should like to speak in opposition to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] some time ago made quite an extensive speech in support of the project for a budget system. While I am inclined to favor this project I do not think it will do away with deficiency bills or bills of this character. In times of war like these inevitably emergencies will arise without the fault of either the committee or the Government. It will be impossible in advance to prepare for all of these emergencies which through the exigencies of war come upon us. So we have this large deficiency bill at this time. I might, however, make one suggestion which I think would have something to do with reducing the amount of deficiencies in the future, and that is in the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts who spoke a moment ago [Mr. TREADWAY].

Contractors who come here have the greatest difficulty in many instances in finding where the man is to whom they should submit their bids or their proposals. The consequence is that, not being able to find out where these proposals should be submitted, contracts are made on the open market by Government officials, or perhaps made with some kind of competitive bidding, but very much above the price at which other parties were willing to furnish the same or even better goods. The engineers' office here, or at least one branch of the engineers, has a most excellent system in that respect. It posts up in the offices, upon a large board, where anybody can plainly see it, the prices which it has been paying for articles and the articles which it needs and ought to have, and for which it seeks prices in the future. Under this system it could list bids which would be obtainable of the articles or goods desired and the prices heretofore paid by the various Government departments, which in a number of instances, I have found, has been up far above the market price; not intentionally, perhaps, but because they did not come in contact with all the parties ready to furnish the articles and desirous of furnishing them if they only knew to whom they could go.

I learned only the other day that a gentleman who wanted a contract for making detonators for fuses, as an instance of how the departments are coordinated, after being shoved around from pillar to post, found who was thought to be the proper man to submit bids to, and that man told him that the Government had no need for anything of the kind; that the contracts had all been let. He went away, but afterwards saw a business man of his acquaintance, who told him that he was sure there had been a mistake, and upon going around he found another official, who told him that that was just what they needed and had to have, and what they were willing to pay a good price for.

Matters of this kind are inevitable as long as there is so much haste in furnishing articles for which the need is great. But, at the same time, if some system was adopted whereby it would be easy for parties to come here and find the articles they wanted and what prices the department would pay, a great amount would be saved to the Government.

I understand that the Secretary of War has properly issued an order that there shall be no concealment of prices paid for the different articles. The Secretary of War, of course, has nothing to conceal and the department has nothing to conceal; but at the same time there has been a great difficulty on the part of contractors, and I myself had great difficulty, in finding out prices paid for some particular articles at an earlier date. I assume from the action of the Secretary of War that that was something he did not and would not approve. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to secure a little more information along this same line from the chairman of the committee, who has been so kind in his explanation to me. This matter came to my attention through the fact that on a number of occasions a very large contractor in my neighborhood had not been able to secure any opportunity to so much as figure on a propo-

sition. There is no question about the ability of this concern in the way of big contracts. Some of the largest mills in western Massachusetts and large hospitals have been built by this concern, but on inquiry here in Washington they could not get any information. They could not find to whom to apply either for specifications or for necessary data on which to so much as suggest themselves as possible contractors. They have had correspondence and interviews with the committee of Council of National Defense, or a subcommittee, and were told that there was no question as to their reputation or ability, and when the opportunity was offered they would be given a chance to bid, but that opportunity never came. Now, the reason why I would like to know, and they would, because it is not so much that these other men get the work, but here is a large concern, capable of doing this work, as hundreds of others are throughout the country, and they are losing their organization, they are losing skilled workmen, who are going somewhere else for employment, and when the war is over they will be absolutely disorganized in taking up the line of work they had previously performed.

The gentleman referred to the fact that this matter is in the hands of Gen. Littell, and he states that in all probability this same method will be continued in future contracts. If that is true, that the authorities only desire to have the very largest contractors to be considered in letting contracts, why do they not tell the contractors outright that they have no chance whatever for getting any Government work? That would be treating them fairly instead of, in the slang expression, "passing the buck," and let them think they are going to have a chance. According to the information from the chairman, this same method will continue. In fairness to similar concerns to the one to which I refer capable of carrying out a big contract, why should not they be told that they may cease their efforts to get some of this Government work?

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Does my colleague understand or contend that Gen. Littell has anything to say as to whom contracts shall be awarded?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am so informed by the chairman of the committee. The men that have been here have gone to subcommittees and to the Committee on National Defense, assuming that they had the authority. That is one line that I am trying to get information on, but the chairman of the committee informs us that Gen. Littell has all the responsibility. Just where the Committee on National Defense comes in, what methods Gen. Littell pursues, just why none of these large corporations can get a look-in seems to me to be a subject worthy of consideration. But it seems to me that we should get information before the smaller contractors that there is no use in their applying for work if the scheme the chairman of the committee states is to be adopted by the department.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman from Massachusetts must have misunderstood the chairman, although I did not hear his statement, that Gen. Littell has the entire responsibility for all of these contracts. As I understand it, Gen. Littell is the man who executes the contracts, does the paper work, but the decision as to whom the contract shall be let to is made by this subcommittee of the Council of National Defense. Gen. Littell has no more to say about it than has the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman's idea is that Gen. Littell is the rubber stamp to the Council of National Defense.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is not the information imparted by the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I understand that Maj. Starrett is the man who reads the bids and passes upon them; that Maj. Starrett has a brother in the firm of George A. Fuller Co., and that perhaps is the reason why the friends of the gentleman from Massachusetts could get no contract.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask a question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire whether this Maj. Starrett, of whom the gentleman speaks, is a member of that large construction company known as the Starrett-Thompson Construction Co.?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have heard that that is true. I am simply giving what has passed as rumor around through the Chamber.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any authoritative information as to the total amount that has been parceled out to these large construction companies? I know that Stone & Webster have had large contracts for constructing buildings at the Rock Island Arsenal, and in various parts of the country. Has the gentleman or the chairman of the committee any information as to the total amount of contracts that have been parceled out to these very large construction companies?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to answer in my own time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking information.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have no definite information on the subject.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed, I would like to say that my general criticism is not directed to the single idea that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] expresses. I am looking at it from a broader point of view than one particular firm. The person or persons who have authority over letting contracts ought to announce—if that is their policy—that only the few largest concerns will be given consideration in assigning Government work.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that what I said a few moments ago quite bears the construction placed upon it by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE]. I stated then, as I state now, the man primarily responsible and who signs the contract is Gen. Littell; and I take it that a man who signs a contract is responsible, and he can not get rid of that responsibility by saying that somebody else told him to do it. I never heard of any such rule in court or out of court, in Government or out of Government. The man who is responsible now is Gen. Littell. The man who advised him in the past and who presumably is advising him now is Maj. Starrett. The old committee, which was under the Council of National Defense as it was first organized, was entitled "Subcommittee on Emergency Construction and Contracts," and was composed of W. A. Starrett, chairman; C. M. Lundoff; M. C. Tuttle; Maj. William Kelley, of the office of the Chief of Ordnance; F. L. Olmstead; and J. B. Talmadge, secretary. I stated yesterday that a great many of these subcommittees had been abolished under the reorganization. The present member of the committee of the Council of National Defense dealing with emergency construction and contracts is Maj. W. A. Starrett. Who is under him I do not know. I am glad the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has stated what he has touching Maj. Starrett. I have been told, not in an official way and I do not know how accurately, that he was a member of the Starrett Construction Co., but has not been for some four years, and while it is true that his brother has membership in the Fuller Construction Co., I have never been able to find anybody who was prepared to present anything definite touching the wrongful use of any power that Maj. Starrett may have. Either there is something wrong or there is not. If there is something wrong I hope that anybody in this House or elsewhere who has facts and not rumor will take the responsibility of presenting the matter to the Congress and to the Government, because I am sure that nobody in the Government, legislative or administrative, desires anything to continue that is wrongful. This is what frequently happens. Men in various sections of the country come on here desiring to do work that they are not competent for, but no man has yet been created so modest that he recognizes his inability to do a thing, and he insists that he and his concern can do it, whether they can or not. If he does not get the consideration that he thinks he ought to have he goes away declaring that there is an inner group that controls things.

There may be. I have no information touching it. For myself, when the war broke out I adopted this rule, that I would not recommend any human being for any contractual relationship with the Government of any kind or character, and that rule I have kept. This committee did not have opportunity or time, nor was it its function, to go into this sort of inquiry. We have published here in the hearings heretofore the character of the contracts. We have published the cost and the amount that has been paid these people, and I understand that this whole matter is now the subject of inquiry by other committees that have more direct jurisdiction of it. I hope the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], in view of the necessary inference to be drawn from the statement that he has made, will follow it up so that he will be in a position to either tell the House that he thinks there is no basis whatever for believing that Maj. Starrett is giving contracts because of those who are of kin to him or of former or present business association, or that he will show wherein it is being done, in order that we may correct the abuse.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have had very little to do or experience with those who have the responsibility of making contracts. I have, however, had a little experience in that regard in one case. Some gentlemen came here from my State believing they were equipped and qualified through their eastern connections to take Government contracts of considerable size, and they asked me to present them to the men who had charge of these matters. I was in position to testify that these gentlemen were high-minded and conscientious men, and I presented them to Maj. Starrett. They were treated with consideration. I was impressed with the fact that the officer in question seemed to have had a good deal of experience and probably understood his business.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I ask whether Maj. Starrett is a Regular Army officer?

Mr. MONDELL. I know nothing of Maj. Starrett except the fact that he is connected with the Council of National Defense and that he is chairman of the board that makes recommendations in the matter of contracts. I do not know anything about his antecedents, but he impressed me as a courteous, capable gentleman.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Is it the major or his brother who is at the head of this commission that is giving out contracts? I understand there are two Starretts.

Mr. MONDELL. The Maj. Starrett I refer to is, as I understand it, the chairman of a board under the Council for National Defense, whose duty it is to recommend to the War Department the granting of contracts.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman a question in that connection?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. Are those contracts in the ordinary business form that building concerns would receive if they were bidding for contracts, and have they a regular form of specifications?

That is what I am trying to get at and that is the line of inquiry I was asking the chairman of the committee when his thought went to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in his reply rather than to me. I would like to get some idea, some knowledge of the form of contract, the method of letting a contract, the kind of competitive bids that may be asked, and the various business methods pursued by the department. If it is by Maj. Starrett, I would like that information.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that many contracts—I do not know what proportion of them—are not let under competitive bidding, but are given out on the cost-plus basis to firms or corporations agreed upon, recommended and approved by the gentlemen in the War Department to whom they make their recommendations.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I think it was testified before the committee that the identical character of contract that was printed in the hearings last fall touching this work is being used now. The gentleman will find on page 578 of the hearings in connection with the urgent deficiency bill of last fall the contract in which all the details of it are set out, fixing the rental, fees, and the contractor's fees, and all the details of the contract.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall be glad to look at that a little.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the cost-plus method, as I understand it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. And I understand most of these contracts are of that character—

Mr. TREADWAY. May I repeat my question—

Mr. MONDELL. And they are not by competitive bidding.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I repeat my question to the gentleman from Wyoming, if he has any information as to the principle on which these favored contractors are selected? That is at the bottom of the thing.

Mr. MONDELL. I have very little information, but I am very glad to give the House the benefit of what little information I have, and that arose out of this one particular case. I was impressed with the bearing of Maj. Starrett and his apparent knowledge of the matters that he had in charge. I, however, received this impression. The department naturally desires to secure contractors for this Government work who have large going administrative and technical organizations, and that kind of a concern generally is a busy concern, doing a good deal of work, and under the theory that I think somewhat prevails in making the recommendations, it occurred to me that a large concern which would be able to present evidence of its ability to do extensive work and do it speedily, a concern that had a large organization, might have an advantage over a con-

cern with a small organization which had not been doing a large amount of work. It might be the fact, however, that the smaller concern, with its smaller organization ready and willing and prepared to put all of its energy and all of its experience in a particular work, might, as a matter of fact, be better prepared to carry out a given contract than a big concern which might make a better showing. While I did not go into the matter carefully enough to express a definite opinion, my notion is that in a matter of this sort there might be a temptation to lean upon the big concerns with their very considerable organization, large capital, and proven ability to do work, to the exclusion of a smaller outfit or organization, even though the smaller organization might be quite as well prepared and in a more favorable situation to perform a particular work than the larger corporation or organization in view of their other responsibilities.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think as a good business proposition, looking into the future, that these smaller concerns, absolutely reputable and capable of doing the smaller jobs, should be given consideration in view of the conditions that are likely to appear after the war is over if these smaller concerns become entirely disorganized?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is undoubtedly true; there will be no disagreement on that point.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. Now, on that point, any organization that proves to the officials in charge that has business standing and ability and engineering force and an organization that will enable it to carry on that kind of work, ought to be considered. I have not enough information on the subject to say that they are not considered. I did get the impression that there might be a disposition to lean upon the larger corporations, and larger organizations by reason of the general showing they could make of financial responsibility, of large undertakings and accomplishments—large going organizations. A portion of all this equipment so useful and essential in a big piece of work might, however, be required or utilized on other Government work which they had secured or on private work. However, I assume all these things are taken into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. If I might have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that the one consideration that the Counsel of National Defense or Gen. Littell had to be controlled by, and the only one that they should give consideration to at all, was to get this work done and done as speedily as possible, and the question of justice or injustice to a small contractor or favors to a large contractor were not elements that enter into the matter at all? And that in doing the thing that they should have done, is it not a fact that this complaint might just as well arise and yet these men do their duty?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, the first and essential thing is to have the work done as speedily and as economically as possible.

Mr. KINKAID. If the gentleman will permit, I want to say in justice to the administration—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman be very brief?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes. To my personal knowledge, Maj. Starrett, from the very start of the application in a certain instance, where a contract of the kind was in contemplation, gave very friendly consideration to a comparatively small firm, a relatively small organization, and the contract is going to be let, and is being let to that very firm by Gen. Littell on the recommendation of the chairman, Maj. Starrett.

Mr. MONDELL. I am very glad to have that testimony. I have no thought of criticising in the matter of the selection of the people to whom the contracts are let. It is very evident, however, that one of the greatest corporations, one, I take it, that was a great and going concern with an enormous amount of capital behind it and which no doubt made a splendid showing, is the corporation that seems to have most completely fallen down and furnished the country with the most astounding scandal that has grown out of the war.

Now, so much for that. About these cost-plus contracts, it may be possible that it was necessary to enter into that kind of a contract in some cases, but we have had an unhappy experience under them. I fear we will continue to have. It seems to me they ought to be limited to the cases of the direst necessity. There are some men and a great many women, probably a ma-

jority of them, who are virtuous by reason of their love of virtue and a high sense of obligation to themselves and their God and their fellow men. But with the many men, my opinion is that to whatever extent they may be honest from the dictates of conscience, their inclination to honesty arises more out of the very patent fact that in the main honesty is the best policy; that virtue brings its own reward, and the way of the evildoer is, in the long run, a sad way. The affairs of mankind are conducted largely in view of those facts and considerations. When you change the system of doing things in the world, based on our knowledge of human nature, and adopt a system that holds out encouragement and incentive to waste, extravagance, the padding of pay rolls, the increasing of cost, and practices of every sort and kind that an evil mind can invent and an easy conscience carry out; when you base your business on that sort of rule and policy there can be but one outcome. The cost-plus contract does not reward virtue, honesty, economy, and fair dealing, and practices based on considerations of justice and fair dealing to the Government and the people. It rewards extravagance; it rewards increases of cost; it rewards waste; it rewards all of those things that ought to be avoided in all business transactions. No policy that does this can be commended or produce good results.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to unduly restrict debate, but I think in view of the fact that there is nothing pending there has been quite a little talk, and I would like to go on with the reading of the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I have five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole offered that motion. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think it unfortunate that contracts of this character should be recommended by anyone who is related in any way with persons connected with the construction companies to whom the contracts are let. It was for that reason that I raised the question here a moment ago as to the relationship of Maj. Starrett to these construction companies.

I have never met Maj. Starrett. I do not know whether he is a Regular Army officer, or whether he belongs to the Provisional Army, or what his relations are to the title that he bears, but I think it unfortunate for the War Department that he should be selected to pass upon contracts let to the Starrett Construction Co. or the George M. Fuller Construction Co. The Fuller Construction Co. has many contracts for the construction of these cantonments. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] asked the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] if it was not the purpose in the letting of these contracts to have the construction pushed to an early completion. That should be the intention, but the contractor does not push the construction to an early completion, but purposely delays for the purpose of increasing the cost of the construction.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit right there, the form of contract is such as to make a maximum, and it is to his interest to get the work done as quickly as possible.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not out of these five minutes.

But the fact is that the bosses tell the men not to hurry while the contractor is within the maximum cost. They tell the men, "Do not take that 8-foot board there; saw 8 feet off this 16-foot board. Men stand around waiting to go to work from 8 o'clock in the morning until 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon, without doing anything, and complaining that they have not been put to work. They are told they have no complaint; that they are getting their pay.

I talked with a captain in an Army cantonment, who showed me the steam radiator in his room. It is a small radiator. It had been set up in his room by two plumbers and two helpers, and they were three days making the connection. He was waiting in the hallways and other places while these men were putting in all this time in setting up this radiator, a work that any plumber or any plumber's helper could have done in 20 minutes, and it was only completed when the colonel ordered that that radiator be placed and placed immediately.

There are men down here within the reach of the voice of some of the men who speak in this House, on this side of the Potomac River, wasting time during the freezing weather instead of rushing the construction of the buildings on which they are at work. I have talked with men to and from their

work, who were not doing a half day's work, but with a full day's pay, doing it with the full knowledge of the overseer or the men representing the contractor.

These are things that ought not to be overlooked. These are matters that are of common knowledge throughout the country. Farmers, carpenters, plumbers, business men of every character, who have visited these cantonments and have seen the manner in which they are constructed, know that there has been a waste of the employees' time and a waste of the public money, and they attribute the waste of time and the waste of money very largely to the cost-plus contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Mileage: For mileage to commissioned officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, \$3,000,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the employment of clerks in the departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations for the Quartermaster Corps shall be expended on printing unless the same shall be done at the Government Printing Office, or by contract after due notice and competition, except in such cases as the emergency will not admit of the giving notice of competition, and in cases where it is impracticable to have the necessary printing done by contract the same may be done, with the approval of the Secretary of War, by the purchase of material and hire of the necessary labor for the purpose.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to strike out the last word of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is in the middle of the paragraph on page 33.

Mr. NORTON. I desire to discuss the paragraph that has just been skipped over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will finish the reading of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Henry C. Chappell: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to pay to Henry C. Chappell, of New London, Conn., from proper appropriations of the Quartermaster Corps the sum of \$58,50 paid by him for advertisements published in newspapers soliciting enlistments in the Quartermaster Reserve Corps of the Army for service in a motor-truck company of the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the item for the purchase of horses and mules for the Quartermaster's Department. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how much is intended to be used for that purpose?

Mr. SHERLEY. None of it; none of the amount carried in this bill is in connection with the purchase of horses or mules.

Mr. NORTON. The provision is such that all or any part of the \$26,000,000 appropriated under the item may be used for that purpose?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, what happens is simply that we carry the regular language that is carried in the Army appropriation bill, and technically the money is available for any of the purposes enumerated, but the testimony discloses that it is not asked for that purpose at all.

Mr. NORTON. None of it is estimated for that purpose?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. NORTON. I desire to say to the committee and to the members of the Committee on Appropriations that there has come to my particular notice the manner in which horses have been purchased for the Army. Most of the horses, or a large part of the horses, purchased for the Army during the last year have been purchased in the Northwest. There the Army has been following the practice of purchasing these horses chiefly from contractors and horse dealers instead of from horse growers and farmers. In my own particular section of the country a very bad policy, to say the least, was followed last fall and last summer in the purchase of horses and mules for the Government by the Quartermaster's Department of the Army. The usual practice was to give to some middleman or horse dealer a contract to furnish the Government with 100 horses at a fixed price. The price for Cavalry horse weighing 900 to 1,050 pounds being

\$165 and the price for light-artillery horses weighing 1,100 to 1,350 pounds being \$185 a head.

The man holding that contract then advertised that there would be a Government inspection at a certain town. The Government inspectors appeared there to examine the horses. In most cases the contractor had purchased no horses. They were on the day advertised for the inspection brought in by farmers and by horse growers and inspected on the ground by the Government inspector. For any horse that passed the Government inspection the contractor received the Government price as fixed in the contract. These contractors in turn paid the farmers from \$90 to \$115 for the cavalry horses they turned over to the Government and from \$125 to \$140 for the light artillery horses. For the cavalry horses the contractors received from the Government \$165 a head and for the light artillery horses \$185 to \$190 a head.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there was a Government officer at that time to pass upon them, so that the contractor took no chances on the horses?

Mr. NORTON. In many cases they absolutely took no chances whatever, excepting the chance of taking and cashing the warrant that was given by the officer representing the Quartermaster's Department at the close of the sale.

Last fall I made some personal inquiry into the methods of purchasing horses for the Government. I asked the quartermaster's department at Fort Keogh, Mont., why at these inspections farmers were not advised by the officer representing the Government what price was being paid by the Government for the horses accepted by the Government. On different occasions the Army officers conducting these inspections had refused to tell farmers who had asked them the price the Government was paying for their horses. I was told by the captain in charge at Fort Keogh that his officers making this inspection were not permitted by the War Department to give out this information. Some weeks ago I made inquiry at the Quartermaster General's office here in Washington why farmers and horse growers were not told at these inspections the price the Government was paying for the horses accepted, and I was informed that it would be contrary to the rules of the Quartermaster's Department to announce, at an inspection of this kind or in a purchase of this kind, what the Government was paying for the horses. As a result, the contractor in many, many cases, without investing a dollar, made a profit of from \$35 to \$70 on each horse delivered to the Government.

I believe, gentlemen, that those engaged in the horse-raising industry of the country should be given a fair consideration and a square deal by the Government. I believe that if the Government is going to pay those high prices—and they are relatively high prices for horses—the men to receive the benefit of these prices should be the farmers and horse growers who sell them for use by the Government instead of the middlemen, who perform a very small service between the farmers and horse growers and the Government. The practice that is now in vogue in the Quartermaster Department for buying horses is that the Government will make purchases direct from farmers where the farmers agree to deliver to the Government or some shipping point on a railroad at least one carload of horses. In such case the Government will not pay within \$20 a head of what it will pay to a regular contractor for the same kind of horses; that is, in any case the Government protects the contractor to the extent of \$20 a head for each horse. Even under this arrangement few horses are bought direct from farmers. In practice the plan is being worked out about like this: A number of farmers get together in a community and agree to deliver to the Government one or more carloads of horses at a price of \$20 a head less than is being paid by the Government to private contractors. At the same time they request the Quartermaster Department having charge of their section of the country to send an inspector to examine and pass on the acceptance of the horses they have to offer for sale to the Government. A date for the inspection is set by the Quartermaster Department. On this date the farmers bring in their horses for inspection. Often they have brought in two and three hundred horses without having any of them accepted by the officer representing the Quartermaster Department. In many cases Army officers have refused to accept these horses direct from farmers and horse growers, but in such cases there usually have been present at these inspections private buyers who bought many of the horses shown at sacrifice prices and had no difficulty in later disposing of them to the Government on contracts. I believe that the very bad practice and policy pursued by the Quartermaster Department in purchas-

ing horses for the Government should be thoroughly investigated by the Committee on Appropriations when the appropriation for the purchase of horses comes up again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of the Army and its supplies: For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, including the cost of packing and crating; for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties; of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; for travel allowance to officers and enlisted men on discharge; for payment of travel allowance as provided in section 126 of the act approved June 3, 1916, to enlisted men of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, and to members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States and discharged on account of physical disability; for payment of travel pay to officers of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, as prescribed in the act approved March 2, 1901; for travel allowance to persons on their discharge from the United States disciplinary barracks or from any place in which they have been held under a sentence of dishonorable discharge and confinement for more than six months, or from the Government Hospital for the Insane after transfer thereto from such barracks or place, to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment; of the necessary agents and other employees, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 for those authorized to receive the per diem allowance; of clothing and equipment and other quartermaster stores from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipment; of ordnance and ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; for payment of wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; for transportation of funds of the Army; for the hire of employees; for the payment of Army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of full amount of service be paid: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That in expending the money appropriated by this act a railroad company which has not received aid in bonds of the United States, and which obtained a grant of public land to aid in the construction of its railroad on condition that such railroad should be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property over such aided railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provision only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation for such Government transportation as shall at that time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *And provided further*, That nothing in the preceding provisions shall be construed to prevent the accounting officers of the Government from making full payment to land-grant railroads for transportation of property or persons where the courts of the United States have held that such property or persons do not come within the scope of the deductions provided for in the land-grant acts; for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provision for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies, and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the hire of teamsters and other employees; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, \$125,000,000: *Provided further*, That \$75,000 of the appropriation hereby made shall be available for additional pay of employees on harbor boats, quartermaster service, in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether any change in the authorization law as to the compensation of railroads or other transportation lines is embodied in the paragraph under consideration?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. It is the same as the current law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire further if the gentleman can give the information as to the total amount that has been paid to railroads of this country for the transportation of troops up to the present time, since the war began?

Mr. SHERLEY. No, sir; we have not that. The gentleman will appreciate that in considering these items we did not undertake to cover the whole field that the item would by its language seem to cover; but we would ask what the moneys were for, and then confine ourselves to an inquiry in that particular. The committee did not raise the question of pay to

railroads, and the need of such an inquiry did not suggest itself to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was this proposal submitted to the committee during its deliberation, that officers and enlisted men who are obliged to pay for travel in making trips to their homes, or the like, should be exempted from the 8 per cent tax levied by the war-revenue act?

Mr. SHERLEY. No such suggestion came to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been called to my attention, and I think the Congress would have exempted the soldiers if the matter had been called to its attention when we were considering the war-revenue act, that that tax of 8 per cent on railroad tickets should not be levied and collected from officers and enlisted men when they travel and pay for that travel out of their own funds. It is just merely an additional burden placed upon them. But as the committee has not given it consideration, I do not feel inclined at the present moment to offer an amendment that might be subject to a point of order and might provoke discussion. I rose largely to inquire how much had been paid to the railroads. Of course, we are paying them fabulous amounts, and necessarily paying large amounts.

Mr. SHERLEY. No such question was considered by the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. I may say for the information of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that as far as this tax is concerned each officer who travels has a right to sign an exemption certificate on every fare that he pays, and does not have to pay the tax.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not apply to the enlisted men who return from cantonments and camps to their homes on furlough.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it does. I am not sure.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been given different information. I do not think any one of us would wish to tax the transportation that the soldiers pay when they are making these week-end trips from their cantonments and camps to their respective homes. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I reserve the point of order only for the purpose of asking one question of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course this paragraph is not subject to a point of order, but I am glad to give the gentleman any information I can.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the chairman what property it is which is included within the provisions of lines 17, 18, and 19—

Where the courts of the United States have held that such property or persons do not come within the scope of the deductions provided for in the land-grant act.

Can the chairman of the committee indicate in a general way just what that is?

Mr. SHERLEY. Frankly, I will say to the gentleman that this language has been carried in the military appropriation bill for a great many years. I have not had occasion to inquire into the reason of it, and I am unable to advise the gentleman touching it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barracks and quarters: For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees; for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for noncommissioned officers and enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty; of grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and of buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices, and quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, \$52,151,604.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON offers the following amendment: Page 39, line 12, after the words "United States," strike out the rest of the paragraph and insert: "and for the inclosure and completion of the recreation stadium at Camp Cody, N. Mex., and athletic equipment therefor, \$32,166,604."

Mr. SHERLEY. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is at all certain that the amendment is subject to a point of order. However, I appreciate that under the circumstances under which this bill is being considered I must in any event appeal to the chairman of the committee for amiable consideration of the amendment.

The amendment which I have offered is intended to provide a fund of \$15,000 for the completion of the recreation stadium at Camp Cody, N. Mex., and the inclosure thereof, together with athletic equipment therefor.

Every one who knows anything at all about the cantonment at Camp Cody knows that the conditions under which the soldiers are obliged to live are very different from those under which they live in any other cantonment. The camp is located in practically a desert of fine volcanic ash-like sand. It is subject to terrific winds. These winds occur very frequently, and when they do occur they raise clouds of this fine volcanic dust which make it practically impossible for men to be out of doors. A recreation stadium has been erected at Camp Cody—

Mr. JUUL. How did the Government come to locate this cantonment at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. That question has been up a great many times in the House. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JUUL. I take it the conditions are as the gentleman has stated, but how did they come to put the cantonment there?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not answer that question. The conditions are as I have stated. They have been found by Members of this House who have visited that camp. They have been found to be as I have stated by members of the public-safety commissions of the States of Minnesota, Nebraska, and Iowa. There is no question about those conditions. As I say, they have a stadium there now, but they have not the funds with which to inclose it. There is no liberty theater there. They can not use the stadium at times when these great wind storms occur. The result of it is that some thousands of dollars' worth of smilge books that have been sent to the troops at Camp Cody are absolutely worthless. They have no place where they can use them. They have no place where they can have athletic meets or any sort of recreation. At one time they had a tent there, but these terrific winds that come so frequently blew the tent to pieces. If they are to have any recreational or athletic or educational facilities at all these facilities must be of such a character that they can be inclosed to shut out these terrific wind and dust storms. I appeal to the gentleman from Kentucky to permit this amendment to go on this bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the point at which the amendment is offered, without regard to other reasons, makes it clearly subject to a point of order. This is a barracks and quarters paragraph. We are carrying moneys for the purpose of increasing the recreational facilities at the various camps and cantonments. The gentleman's appeal should be to the War Department and not to the Appropriations Committee. We think when this bill passes, they will have sufficient money to take care of all proper needs touching the recreational facilities at camps.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman point out to me where in this bill provision is made for such a proposal as I have submitted?

Mr. SHERLEY. Under military post exchanges there is a provision, although the gentleman ought not to ask me where to amend the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not asking where to amend the bill, I think it is in order here.

Mr. SHERLEY. Jestings aside, we tried to give the War Department funds sufficient to deal properly with the recreational phases of camp life. We suspected that if we were subject to criticism it would be because we had been too liberal.

Mr. ANDERSON. How much does the bill carry for this purpose?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think something over half a million dollars.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will find it on page 41 of the bill, \$550,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and repair of hospitals: For construction and repair of hospitals at military posts already established and occupied, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same; construction and repair of general hospitals and expenses incident thereto; additions needed to meet the requirements of increased garrisons, temporary hospitals in standing camps and cantonments; and, during the fiscal year 1918, for the alteration of permanent buildings at posts for use as hospitals, construction and repair of temporary hospital buildings at permanent posts, construction and repair of temporary general hospitals, rental of grounds and rental and alteration of buildings for use for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including necessary temporary quarters for hospital personnel, outbuildings, heating and laundry apparatus, plumbing, water and sewers, and roads and walks for the same, \$18,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if in the hearings it was disclosed that this amount of money will put the hospital service at the Army cantonments in such shape as to justify a belief that every facility needed for the proper care of the men will be afforded.

Mr. SHERLEY. In reply to the gentleman, I will say we gave them everything they asked for, and apparently they have asked for everything they could think of. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. There was no disposition on the part of the committee to restrict them in these funds?

Mr. SHERLEY. The committee did not restrict them.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military post exchanges: For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established or which may be established hereafter, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$550,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$25,000 of this appropriation may be expended for personal services and no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 24, after the figures "\$550,000," insert: "*Provided*, That of this sum \$15,000 may be used in the completion and inclosure of the recreation stadium at Camp Cody, N. Mex., and equipment thereof."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the matter further. I have said all that I care to say about it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment ought to be adopted. I do not think it ought to be adopted, altogether aside from the merits of the proposal. If we commence the practice on an appropriation bill of this kind of specifying and indicating to the department what sums shall be spent at certain places, we will have confusion worse confounded. The committee tried to be generous. There is to be expended for the comfort and recreation of the soldiers in camps and cantonments more money than was ever expended by any other people at any time for such purposes. I do not say that because of objection to doing everything practical for their comfort, but the amount of money being spent there, the voluntary contributions and funds given by governmental action are large as sums go even in these days. The committee tried to be reasonably generous with the recreation board. We gave them a patient hearing; we went over their figures, having in mind the money they had available and the moneys that are being contributed by various charitable associations. If this particular matter of which the gentleman speaks is as desirable as his statement would lead us to believe, there ought to be funds within the amounts that have been appropriated to take care of it; but for Congress to indicate and direct that it should be so expended would be setting a precedent that would be fraught with great evil in the future.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I was at Camp Cody last fall, and the boys at that camp are without any form of recreation. The various National Guard regiments stationed at that camp had regimental funds upon which they drew to erect this stadium, but the funds became exhausted before the building was completed. It can not be used at the present time because it is not inclosed. Anyone who has been at Camp Cody will understand that all buildings at that place must be inclosed, owing to the frequent and severe sand storms which rage in that section of the country with painful regularity.

There is great need at Camp Cody for some form of recreation. I am almost under the impression that the War Department has entirely forgotten Camp Cody. There is nothing being done at that place for the comfort of the boys, and even the hospital is neglected, according to reports from several who have visited the camp. While I realize that there is a great deal of merit in what the able gentleman from Kentucky says, yet something should be done to take care of the situation.

I visited several cantonments last fall, and every camp visited had very good facilities for entertaining the boys, except at Camp Cody. I was at Camp Cody in November, and they then had a large tent which was used for entertainments, but a severe storm tore it from gudgeon to stern and the boys are absolutely without any form of entertainment—even picture shows—at the present time. I sincerely hope Mr. ANDERSON's amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were 16 ayes and 21 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations made herein for "Regular supplies, Quartermaster Corps," "Barracks and quarters," "Waters and sewers at military posts," "Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage," "Construction and repair of hospitals," "Shooting galleries and ranges," "Barracks and quarters, seacoast defenses," and "Military post exchanges" shall continue available until December 31, 1918.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph, and offer the motion for the purpose of making a few observations on the way some of the money we are appropriating so generously and lavishly is being expended by those in authority.

Among the various items of money appropriated in the section of the bill just read is one for the Quartermaster's Department, and I think this amount, with amounts formerly appropriated for this department, is ample and sufficient to warrant a proper and humane care to the soldiers now serving in the various camps and cantonments who are so unfortunate as to be visited with either sickness or death. I am sure it has been the intention of Congress to furnish every dollar necessary or in any way required to enable the War Department to give the very best of care and attention, including proper medical treatment, to our brave boys now in training, and in case of death to give them decent burial. Congress has done its full duty in this matter.

From divers complaints which have been addressed to me and to other Members of Congress from camps where Illinois soldiers are stationed, I am fearful that the money so generously appropriated by Congress for this purpose is not being in all cases properly and efficiently expended. I make this statement with great reluctance and sincere regret, but am impelled to do so from a profound sense of duty. I speak of this matter now because of a telegram I received this morning, signed by Dr. Sam W. Latham, State senator of Illinois, and by Hon. George W. Bagwell, State mine inspector for the eleventh district of Illinois. This telegram reveals deplorable conditions at Camp Zachary Taylor, and states a most painful and distressing event that has lately transpired there affecting an Illinois soldier and his family and friends. I read the telegram:

ELDORADO, ILL., February 14, 1918.

Representative THOMAS S. WILLIAMS,
Washington, D. C.:

John Alvey, a private from Saline County, in service at Camp Taylor, contracted pneumonia, from which he died. The grieving parents visited Louisville, Ky., and ordered the body shipped home. When the body arrived and the lid was lifted for the friends and relatives to see the last of the remains, imagine their surprise to find the corpse to be that of a negro. The people of Saline County wish to enter a vigorous protest against such preposterous inefficient conduct of our business. We appeal to you, as chosen Representative of the people, to take immediate and strenuous action to correct this deplorable manner of handling the Nation's affairs. We are ready to furnish proof of this statement, and letter follows explaining in detail. For the sake of Illinois and her wonderful, patriotic people, get busy.

SAM W. LATHAM,
State Senator, Fifty-first District.
GEORGE BAGWELL,
State Mine Inspector, Eleventh District.

The name of the soldier is Ferdinand L. Alvey instead of John Alvey, as stated in the telegram just read.

I desire to insert an article appearing in the Daily Register, of Harrisburg, Thursday, February 14, 1918:

TERRIBLE MISTAKE AT CAMP TAYLOR—BODY OF NEGRO SENT HERE INSTEAD OF THAT OF FERDINAND ALVEY.

Harrisburg experienced a shock Thursday morning, the sadness of which is hoped will never be repeated.

As was feared by readers of the Daily Register when it announced in its issue Wednesday that Ferdinand Alvey had grown worse, the popular and respected young man died at that cantonment following an attack of pneumonia, the latter having been brought on by a series of complications.

Mrs. John Alvey, mother of deceased, was at the bedside when her boy breathed his last. She accompanied the remains to this city, arriving Thursday morning. Rude & Templeton immediately transferred the body to their undertaking rooms and many relatives and friends gathered to take an anxious look at their departed associate.

Imagine the shock, the surprise, when the casket revealed the body of a dead negro instead of that of the popular Ferdinand Alvey. Such was the case, and the weeping of the relatives was almost more than the stout-hearted men could bear.

The casket contained the death certificate, the undertaker's certificate, and the shipping certificate, showing the same to contain the body of Ferdinand Lindza Alvey, aged 24 years, giving causes of death and other necessary information. Just where the mistake was made is not known. The undertakers here soon got the wires hot with inquiries to Camp Taylor and the Louisville undertakers.

Where the body of the mourned Ferdinand Alvey is is not known, or was not as we went to press with this paper. The stricken parents, the relatives, and friends have the profound sympathy of the entire community in their sad affair.

Just before the Daily Register went to press a telegram was received from Camp Taylor stating that the mistake was made and the body of the colored soldier boy shipped out before it was detected. The body of Ferdinand Alvey will leave Camp Taylor this afternoon at 5 o'clock and will arrive here Friday morning.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most shocking thing, resulting from a negligence so barbarously cruel and inhuman as to be almost unbelievable, a negligence criminal and inexcusable, demanding stern and speedy punishment.

Saline County, where this occurrence has taken place, is a small county in southern Illinois, whose citizenship is comprised largely of farmers and laboring people. These people are intensely loyal and have demonstrated their sterling patriotism in many ways since the beginning of the war. They have patriotically met every call made upon them. In the Young Men's Christian Association drive last fall the quota for Saline County was \$6,000. Patriotic meetings were held in various parts of the county, and when the campaign was over it was found that \$22,000 had been raised.

In each of the liberty loan campaigns they have oversubscribed their quota, as they did in the call for funds for the Red Cross.

They have not only shown their intense loyalty and love of country in meeting these material demands, but they have ungrudgingly given their loyal sons to the national cause. After the declaration of war and before the passage of the selective-draft law hundreds of brave young men from this county voluntarily enlisted and entered the Military Establishment of the Government. You will find them in the Regular Army, in the National Guard, in the Marine Corps, in the Aviation Corps, in the Medical Reserve Corps, in the Navy, and in every branch of the service.

These people, as do the people throughout all of southern Illinois, stand unreservedly and unitedly behind the Government in this hour of stress and storm, and are willing to give their all in the cause of justice and human liberty. But, Mr. Chairman, they demand, they have the right to demand, that their sons who don the uniform and go forth to fight under the flag, to live or die as God shall will, shall receive humane treatment from their Government. They demand this both for the living and for the dead.

This brave young man, Pvt. Ferdinand Alvey, who died wearing his country's uniform, was entitled to decent burial. His good father and mother, who had given him up as a sacrifice on the altar of freedom, and who had sorrowfully journeyed from their home in Illinois to Camp Taylor to be with him in the last sad hour, and had made arrangements with those in authority to have his body shipped back to the old home that he might have Christian burial at the hands of mourning relatives and friends of his youth and young manhood, should have been spared having a thing so tragic, so cruel, so gruesome, so criminally and brutally careless visited upon them by a Government to which they had made a gift so precious.

Mr. Chairman, I can say no more. Words fail me. The telegram I have just read tells the whole story and reveals a condition of such gross inefficiency and carelessness, such culpable neglect of duty, such brutal inhumanity, as to be almost inconceivable in a Christian Government.

I am not unmindful also of the outrage and great wrong done the young colored soldier and his people and friends. I am not informed as to who he was or his station in life. He died, however, wearing his country's uniform and was entitled to decent and humane burial. No doubt his good old mother, somewhere, perhaps, in a cabin in the mountains of Kentucky, maybe in an humble home in southern Indiana or Illinois, received a shock similar to that experienced by the father and mother of Ferdinand Alvey when the body of some one other than her own son was delivered to her door.

I have had other specific cases of inefficiency and neglect brought to my attention, of course not so horrible as this. I have quietly taken them up with those in authority when I could. I have made no comment. I have put nothing in the

RECORD, and have carefully refrained from criticizing the War Department, appreciating the tremendous burden this war imposes on public officials in every branch of the national service. I would add nothing to the burden now being carried by any public official. I want above all things our great country to emerge victorious out of this awful struggle. Liberty, public law, our peace and security as a great people, are at stake in the conflict. We must win, and I have no respect for any man who would add one ounce to the great burdens already borne by those who are conducting the great conflict. But we can not stand for criminal inefficiency, for brutal inhumanity, in these matters. I consider it my patriotic duty to speak out in matters of this kind.

This is a terrible thing. I denounce it and those responsible for it, whoever they may be. I denounce it in the name and in the memory of Private Ferdinand Alvey, who is gone; I denounce it on behalf of his grief-stricken father and mother; I denounce it on behalf of a million and a half of his comrades now wearing the uniform; I denounce it in the name and on behalf of the great State of Illinois that gave this gallant young man to the service of the Nation, and had a right to expect for him humane treatment in life and decent burial in death.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no one who will not agree in its entirety with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS]. That sort of thing ought to be impossible at these camps and cantonments. I do not know anything about the facts which the gentleman relates, but I assume that he has brought them to the attention of the War Department and that a proper inquiry will be made. Certainly a condition that permits such mistakes to be made is a condition the sooner remedied the better. Yesterday I called attention to the desirability of numbering every soldier in the service in order that he might have a permanent identification that would be positive and quick and sure under all conditions. That suggestion I personally made myself nearly two months ago, to both the War-Risk Insurance Bureau and to The Adjutant General. I am glad to say, as I said yesterday, that I understand that an order has been issued for the numbering of every man in the service, giving each a number that he will retain under all conditions, and which ought to make more certain his identification; but even without that, it is hard to find excuse for such a mistake as the gentleman speaks of. I trust that there may be found some explanation that at least will show that the abuse will not continue any further.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to say just a word about the suggestion of the chairman, made yesterday, that all of our soldier boys should bear a definite number. I do this in view of a matter which is very painful to me in connection with the loss of the *Tuscania*, whereby five soldier boys living near my home went down to a watery grave. Some of the bodies have been recovered. This morning I received a letter from the father of one of those boys, a touching communication referring to the loss of his only son, and I think it is not amiss for me to read it to this House:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., February 13, 1918.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STAFFORD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I thank you very much for your prompt reply to my message in regard to my son who was on board the *Tuscania*. As we have still received no word about him we fear he is among the lost. He was our only son, but we gave him willingly in the service of his country, our great regret being that he was not able to render more effective service before his life was taken.

We do not like to impose upon you, but if you can do anything toward helping us to find out whether his body was found and identified, and if so, where he was buried. We presume it would be impossible to have his body returned to us during the duration of the war, but if we know where he is perhaps we could get some one to look after his grave until this horrible war is over, and then we could go to see him and it might be possible to have his body brought home.

Anything you can do for us will be greatly appreciated. Thanking you, I remain,

Yours, truly,

H. H. PETERSON.

I took the question of burial and disinterment up with the Cemeterial Division of the Quartermaster Corps. The representative of that division informed me that early in the war they recommended to the higher authorities that every one of our soldier boys should not only have an identification number, but two identification tags, with their name attached, to be worn by them, so that there would be no question whatever that in case of death they could be identified. This officer admitted that those boys who went down on the *Tuscania* did not have any identification number, the explanation being that they were not yet assigned to any definite branch of the service.

Five of these boys are from Milwaukee, from my own district, and I have been daily calling up The Adjutant General's office to try to ascertain whether any information has been received as to whether they are still among the missing. The names of

two were listed in the telegraphic dispatches of the Associated Press as having been buried somewhere on the Scottish coast. The representative of the Cemeterial Division assures me that no bodies during the existing war can be brought back, that in France the bodies of those unfortunates who die in battle or by reason of disease have their graves marked in every case and a record is kept of the burial through a regular organization. He also informed me that the Quartermaster Corps undoubtedly is making a record as far as they can of those unfortunates of the *Tuscania* who are being buried in graves along the Scottish coast.

The case of Harry E. Peterson, which I have just cited, had a peculiar significance to me, because he was a West Division High School boy and from my district, a classmate of my nephew, who knew him well. He was a fine type of character. The sentiment that is expressed in this letter is grandiloquent of the devotion and resolve of the father and mother who have lost their all in the ill-fated sinking of the *Tuscania*. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

PANAMA CANAL
CONSTRUCTION.

For continuing the construction and equipment of the Panama Canal, to be expended under the direction of the governor: For completing Dock No. 6 at Cristobal, \$593,190, to continue available until expended; and the limit of cost fixed by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1916, is increased from \$1,500,000 to \$2,093,190.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether it is because of the increased cost of labor and materials that the increased cost of this improvement here is suggested, or whether it is caused in large part by the increase in the character of the improvement?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; it is the actual increase of cost. It is a deficiency. The money that is allowed for this purpose was not sufficient to finish the entire superstructure at all, but simply to finish the foundation. The estimates were made, however, in 1916, and the increased cost in structural steel and other materials going to make the piers is responsible for this deficiency.

Mr. MADDEN. So that the language of the estimate limiting the cost was due in large measure to the fact that the material required to be used in the improvement has increased in price since the estimate was made?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. This dock is a duplicate of a number built down there within the limit of cost heretofore, but the increase in the cost of material makes this deficiency.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment simply to ask the gentleman from Kentucky as to why this No. 6 Dock at Cristobal is lagging behind the others?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was started late.

Mr. TILSON. Is it an extra dock or part of a plan that was originally laid out?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, there was a plan that contemplated at one time this dock to be built, and perhaps docks have yet to be built, but the policy was to build these docks somewhat as traffic demanded them, but they were not all undertaken at one time. This dock was undertaken very much later than the others, and that is the reason for the deficiency.

Mr. TILSON. It got caught in the high-price times?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and chief engineer of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings shall serve in similar capacities in connection with these buildings.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, a question. Are these buildings mentioned in line 22, page 47, the \$2,000,000 concrete buildings that were appropriated for last summer?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not concrete buildings, but the \$2,000,000 frame buildings which were built down in Henry Park.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Are the employees carried in this paragraph all the employees in these buildings?

Mr. SHERLEY. This is simply for the maintenance of the force.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Simply for the maintenance of the force?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How many employees, approximately, are there employed there? Does the gentleman know about how many?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think there will be over 8,000 when they are all fully completed and filled. I do not recall the exact number now.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. In

line 12, page 48, are mentioned 3 forewomen, at \$300 each, and 60 at \$240 each. Now, what I want to ask. Is that all the compensation that these 60 women secure from the Federal Treasury for one year's work, \$240?

Mr. SHERLEY. This is all the salary paid them for the part of the day's work that they give to the Government.

Mr. JUUL. Of course, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what portion of their time they give to the Government.

Mr. SHERLEY. I was just going to tell the gentlemen that they are charwomen and give a certain part of their time in scrubbing and cleaning the buildings. That is the rate of compensation that has been carried for a number of years past. They, of course, are benefited now and will be benefited by an increase in the salary of employees generally that has been and might be enacted by Congress and which is in contemplation.

Mr. JUUL. Will these women get a percentage of the increase in addition to the sum here mentioned?

Mr. SHERLEY. They would get whatever increase is made for employees, and, presumably, if it was a percentage increase they would get that percentage on the sums named here.

Mr. JUUL. I have not figured it out, but it is about 50 or 60 cents a day, and out of that they have to pay 10 cents car fare. And if the gentleman has not absolutely made up his mind to amend his own bill, I certainly will not attempt to do it. I think they should be paid somewhat better than that.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman may be quite right, and yet "the gentleman from Kentucky" is also quite right in not having the bill amended. And I will explain why. The whole policy of this bill is to deal with deficiencies and not carry increases of salary, which can and should be taken up in a different form. Now, just as the amendment that was offered a while ago by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] might have merit as a substantive proposition, standing alone, yet it would have been a legislative mistake, because it would have set the practice of enumerating an expenditure of funds for particular purposes, where that discretion ought to be left with the department. Now, in this case, if we were to undertake to increase these compensations which the gentleman thinks are too small, it would practically open this bill for increase of compensation everywhere along the line. The result would be that one group of men one day, dealing with the matter and another group another day dealing with it, would do all sorts of grotesque things, and instead of being order there would be confusion worse confounded.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will permit me, I ask, if he wants to be liberal, would it not be better if Congress would be a little bit grotesque and occasionally interfere with the chairman of the committee, rather than to ask women in the city of Washington, with prices as they are to-day, to work for \$240 a year?

Mr. SHERLEY. Nobody is asking them to do that. The gentleman assumes this is compensation for their entire time.

Mr. JUUL. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have stated that they are only giving limited time of each day.

Mr. WHEELER. How much time do they put in each day?

Mr. SHERLEY. About two hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If I may be pardoned, I made some inquiry into the subject a year or two ago, and I ascertained that charwomen in the House Office Building got their pay there, and then went over to the Library and did some things there and got their pay; and some of them even went downtown and did cleaning and got their pay there.

Mr. WHEELER. I assume that many of these women are women with families, and only devote a part of their time to the work?

Mr. SHERLEY. Manifestly, I can not answer that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of giving the gentleman from Illinois some information.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If I understood the chairman, this appropriation of \$67,466.67 is simply for maintenance force?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Does this building have a separate electric-light plant or are the lights furnished by the city?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is buying light from the Potomac Electric Power Co.

Mr. SEARS. I notice in this bill, Mr. Chairman, they have one chief electrician at \$1,400 a year and three assistants at \$1,200 a year each. It strikes me the committee has been rather liberal in providing for this building.

Mr. SHERLEY. In point of fact, if the gentleman will permit, I think the mistake is that we have really underestimated some of the help that is going to be needed there, as I think the gentleman will agree if he will examine it and compare it with

any other building in Washington. These three buildings are grouped and are larger than the War and Navy Building, the Treasury Building, or most of the buildings with which the gentleman is familiar. They asked for six electricians and assistants, and we cut them to four.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make this observation. I am satisfied the chairman has cut it, and I am also surprised that the cut was made. This may be unusual in the city of Washington, but some of the Members of this Congress have had experience at home in running electric-light plants lighting an entire city, and no such expense as that would be considered for one moment by the citizens of any town or by any Member of Congress if they knew they were employing a chief electrician and two assistant electricians to look simply after the light in a building, when anybody who knows anything about electricity to-day knows that there is nothing to do but replace a light now and then. I am satisfied this would not be indorsed by our constituents. I have hoped that after this war a wave of economy will strike the country and that we would get back to earth once more and cease taxing our own people so much in order that people can hold good jobs in the city of Washington.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am very much gratified at the disposition of economy on the part of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] and I hope it will prove contagious generally. However, his conception of the duties of these electricians is inadequate, I think. Their duties amount to something more than replacing worn-out electric lights with perfect ones. I think it only fair to say that there is a million square feet of floor space. There are special electrical systems for checking up the guards of this building and for fire-alarm purposes, which at this time are matters of great importance. There are many other duties that fall to the lot of these people. But I do not want by what I am saying to discourage the gentleman or anybody else from an awakened spirit of economy.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, there is only \$5,000 of this sum to be paid to electricians.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, nobody had any idea—

Mr. MADDEN. But I think the impression of the gentleman was that the whole \$67,000 was being paid to electricians.

Mr. SEARS. I did not intend to convey that impression. There are also two painters.

Mr. MADDEN. And two painters can not do the work required there, and five painters or ten painters can not do it.

Mr. SEARS. Perhaps not. I never painted a day in my life; but two electricians can look after it.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the figures of the Committee on Appropriations will be so low that they will be found to be inadequate.

Mr. SHERLEY. I frankly stated to the House that a mistake had been made in this force and there will have to be an increase in it.

Mr. MADDEN. Surely there will.

The Clerk read as follows:

TEMPORARY OFFICE BUILDINGS.

For two three-story temporary office buildings of reinforced concrete with wings 60 feet wide, one for the Navy Department to contain approximately 940,000 square feet and one for the War Department to contain approximately 835,000 square feet, to be erected under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy in Potomac Park west of Seventeenth Street and south of B Street, beginning with the Navy Department Building at a point not less than 235 feet west of the westerly curb line of Seventeenth Street and 50 feet south from the southerly curb line of B Street and extending southerly not more than 620 feet from the said B Street curb line and westerly to a point not beyond the easterly building line of Twenty-first Street, including electrical equipment and a temporary heating plant for both buildings, to be located south of D Street and west of Twenty-fifth Street, with necessary connecting mains, \$5,775,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against this paragraph.

I make it upon the ground, Mr. Chairman, that the construction of this building has not been authorized by law, and upon the further ground that the appropriation is not to continue or to complete a work already begun or in progress.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman may reserve the point of order for a minute.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am perfectly willing to do that, and I will say to the gentleman that if he will let it go over—and we can not dispose of the bill to-day, anyhow—until Monday, I will reserve it.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is not any doubt that the matter is subject to a point of order if the gentleman wants to take the responsibility of making the point of order.

There is nothing more important to this Government at this time than the construction of these buildings as quickly as

possible. The committee has not sought to take jurisdiction of this matter for the sake of having jurisdiction. We have all the work we can do, and then some, and we are not hunting new work for the Committee on Appropriations. But when situations are acute, when situations that affect the prosecution of the war come forward, that committee will in the future, as in the past, endeavor to deal with them; and for us not to have brought in these matters would have subjected the committee to criticism of the most severe kind. In the event the gentleman from Florida desires to make the point of order, I shall, of course, ask the Committee on Rules to bring in a rule making in order this important paragraph.

Mr. SEARS. What is the immediate necessity for the passage of this proposition? Is it lack of office space?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; lack of office space. The lack is so acute that to-day there is serious embarrassment in the efficiency of the various corps of the War Department and other departments of the Government.

Mr. SEARS. Then there is a lack of space?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] insist on his point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, so far as the urgency of this matter is concerned, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which has jurisdiction of this subject, could have heard this matter and could have brought in this matter authorizing it at any time.

I am making the point of order, Mr. Chairman, simply to preserve the jurisdiction of the committees of this House. If it is not proper that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should have jurisdiction to authorize these buildings, then the House ought, by rule, to take the jurisdiction away from it and give it to the Committee on Appropriations or some other committee.

It would have been as easy to have submitted the proposition to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds as to take it to the Committee on Appropriations. I do not see that any time has been gained by taking it to the Committee on Appropriations. We have been here since the beginning of the session of Congress, and our committee has been ready at all times to attend to business.

I want to say further, that while this building may be urgent, when I was a member of a public-buildings commission, composed of six Representatives and six Senators and three outside officials, representatives of the War Department and Navy Department came to that commission and represented that if they could get a million square feet of space it would be ample for the overflow of these two departments during the war, and we gave it to them. Now, without consulting us further, without even going before the Public Buildings Commission before it expired by limitation, or going before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, an appropriation is brought in here authorizing the construction of 2,500,000 more square feet of space for these same people, and I submit that the orderly way to dispose of these matters is to go to the proper committee having jurisdiction of them and having those committees investigate them. We have investigated all these other matters. Those matters of public buildings have all been submitted to us, and they have had plenty of time to present this proposition. It is not right, upon the plea of urgency, to take jurisdiction from committees in this way, and I therefore make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For two three-story temporary office buildings of the type erected in Henry Park, one to be located in Seaton Park (north) between Four-and-a-half and Sixth Streets and south of Missouri Avenue and to contain approximately 370,000 square feet and one to be located on the Mall between Seventh and Eighth Streets and B Street north and B Street south and to contain approximately 300,000 square feet, and for a three-story temporary office building of reinforced concrete to be located in Seaton Park (south) between Four-and-a-half and Sixth Streets and north of Maine Avenue and to contain approximately 270,000 square feet, including heating and lighting and the necessary connections, to be erected under the direction of the Secretary of War for the use of the War Department, \$2,377,500.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that on the same ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. Without objection, the point of order will also be sustained to lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, because they no doubt pertain to that same paragraph. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The maintenance and protection of all of the foregoing temporary buildings when completed shall be under the supervision and direction of the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the point of order will be sustained to that paragraph.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, in considering the deficiencies which have been presented to the House, had to consider, among other things, the need of additional clerks, and they had to consider questions of rent; they had to consider the various activities of the Government. It was only by a consideration of these matters that that committee or any other committee could intelligently arrive at the needs of the Government touching additional buildings in the District of Columbia. It followed of necessity that if we were to examine intelligently into matters pertaining to additional clerks, matters pertaining to rent, matters pertaining to the activities of the Government, we had also to consider the matter of new buildings, where to be located, and the extent of them.

I repeat, the Committee on Appropriations has not sought to interfere with the jurisdiction of any other committee, but the Committee on Appropriation is impressed with the fact that more important than the prerogatives of committees is the prosecution of this war, and it indulges in the fond hope that that viewpoint will be somewhat concurred in by the House of Representatives. The putting out of this bill of these provisions, if continued, will result in many days of delay in connection with the building program that is now pressing, and which is so pressing that I have been not only in daily but frequently hourly communication with the various departments, they begging that they be allowed to proceed with some of the building program without waiting for the authorization of Congress.

The building commission of which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds speaks went out of existence in December. Manifestly the Committee on Appropriations could not lay before a commission that no longer existed matters that might have pertained to it when it did exist. And I repeat that I shall ask the House—not as a matter of sustaining the Committee on Appropriations, not as a matter of taking anything away from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but as a matter of first necessity to the Government in the prosecution of the war—to make these items in order by a rule, so that the House may have a chance to pass upon the wisdom of the proposals here submitted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is true that the Public Building Commission has gone out of existence, but does not the gentleman think that when a matter is submitted to his committee that clearly belongs to another committee, the proper thing would be to refer the gentleman submitting it to that other committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. Frankly, and I say it to the gentleman in all kindness, I do not believe that it would be possible, and that without regard to personnel, for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, without going largely into the scope of the whole deficiency bill, to arrive at a determination touching the building needs here in Washington now, because the situation now is not a normal one. Oh, the gentleman may smile, but if the gentleman had worked as I have worked and the members of my committee have worked for more than a month past in trying to correlate the number of employees that are to be in the departments, now and subsequently, to the amount of space that is here—if he had sent out to every department of this Government a request, and had had a return as to the space that is being used, the rents that are being paid for it, and the amount of space that they expect to use, then he would have found that there is something more than simply a building program, as ordinarily understood, for the consideration of a committee dealing with the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I should like to ask the gentleman how he makes a deficiency out of this matter at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not make a deficiency out of it as regards money. I make a deficiency out of it as regards the things needed, and in this war the important thing is to get a result and not consider simply the desires and the prerogatives of various and sundry individual Members and of committees.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I think the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is as thoroughly patriotic a committee as the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably. It is not a question of patriotism, and nobody is suggesting that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And I want to say further that I think, without any reference to the question of coordination, and the question of deficiencies here and there, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are as capable of dealing with a building of this character, and we would do it just as promptly. But this item has no place on a deficiency bill to start with, because it is not a deficiency and does not relate to a deficiency.

Mr. SHERLEY. That would be true of the building program that took place last year. That would be true of any building program that would now be submitted. It would not be a deficiency in the sense of money, but it would be a deficiency in the other sense, and the gentleman is putting a construction very much narrower than the facts warrant upon what constitutes deficiencies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. Now the concrete fact is that if this is not carried here there will be a delay of weeks in this important work.

Mr. JUUL. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky another question. Is not the gentleman from Kentucky reversing himself now?

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be. I am not conscious of it.

Mr. JUUL. In his discussion with the gentlemen of the Building Committee a little while ago the gentleman from Kentucky ruled that a matter of a little new work down at Camp Cody where the sand storms occur was entirely out of order. Is not this a complete reversal of what the gentleman ruled before?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not see it.

Mr. JUUL. That was a new appropriation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well!

Mr. JUUL. This is new work.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well!

Mr. JUUL. It should have gone to that committee. You ruled properly that you could not take up this matter, because it was new legislation.

Mr. SHERLEY. The Chair ruled that way. The gentleman from Kentucky did not and can not pass on that question here.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: For subsistence, \$31,000;
For household, \$45,000;
For repairs, \$2,000;
In all, \$78,000.
Eastern Branch, Togus, Me.: For subsistence, \$5,000;
For household, \$30,000;
For farm, \$1,000;
In all, \$36,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether these increases are due to the increased number of inmates in these homes or to the increased cost of living?

Mr. SHERLEY. They are practically due to the increased cost of supplies in the way of fuel and food and forage.

Mr. COX. Not much of it, then, is due to the increased number of soldiers?

Mr. SHERLEY. In only one place, as I recall, was that a factor.

Mr. COX. Where was that—in Indiana?

Mr. SHERLEY. In the Pacific Branch.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation: For travel allowance of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment; transportation of enlisted men and apprentice seamen and applicants for enlistment at home and abroad, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation to their homes, if residents of the United States, of enlisted men and apprentice seamen discharged on medical survey, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of sick or insane enlisted men and apprentice seamen to hospitals, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force to and from duty, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers, and for railway guides and other expenses incident to transportation, \$2,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the chairman of the committee inform me if this \$2,000,000 item for travel allowance to enlisted men, and so forth, which by special provision is made to include the Naval Reserve Force, also includes the Coast Guard personnel, which has been taken over by the Navy Department under the act combining the Life-Saving Service with the Revenue-Cutter Service?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, these services have been taken over by the Navy, and the appropriations for the Coast Guard are first available. If they are not sufficient, the moneys would be paid out of the naval appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Then the gentleman thinks this language is broad enough to permit that?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. There is an express statute which says that that shall be done. These services, when they come within the naval service, are subject to the rules that appertain to the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. But I was interested to know why this paragraph made special mention of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. SHERLEY. The Naval Reserve are in a different class from the Coast Guard Service. There was formerly a special fund for the Naval Reserve, and in order to discontinue that practice they were expressly enumerated here.

Mr. WALSH. One further point. What is meant by "stragglers"? This provision says "deserters and stragglers." Are those men that have wandered off?

Mr. SHERLEY. A straggler is a man who has overstayed his leave, and yet is not strictly a deserter.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Bureau Yards and Docks: For contingent expenses and minor extensions and minor improvements of public works at navy yards and stations, \$2,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the chairman state the distinction between contingent expenses of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and minor extensions and minor improvements and the repairs and extensions under the previous item? Can the gentleman state whether these are permanent improvements or extensions made necessary by war emergency?

Mr. SHERLEY. They are funds that overlap; there is no line of distinction.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hampton Roads, Va., naval operating base: For additional for payment of compensation for property taken over under the authority contained in the deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, \$55,072.25, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the chairman state whether this is the item that provides for the purchase of a part of the old Jamestown Fair exposition grounds?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; this is a part of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What progress was made toward the Government getting title to all the tract, and whether it was necessary to resort to commandeering. There was considerable opposition to the plan suggested and there was a compromise agreed upon whereby the act went through the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. Under the act as it passed Congress the President was authorized to take possession and did take possession of this land. A commission was created to determine the amount of compensation to be paid the owners. The commission made its report. That report has been acquiesced in by a certain number of the property owners and the compensation accepted. By a certain other number it has been rejected, and under the law three-quarters of the price so fixed is to be paid them and the balance left as a matter of suit. There were 22 claimants who declined to accept the award.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the acreage or the extent of the property that they control?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not give it from memory, but the gentleman will find it in a report made, known as the report of the Board for Acquiring a Naval Site at Hampton Roads, Va. He will find what he seeks in that report and a great deal more which is set out there. The effect of the act of Congress is going to be, I fear, that instead of saving money we will spend a little more than the price agreed to by the House conferees of the Appropriation Committee in conference with the Senate conferees which the House rejected and for which it substituted a provision under which this action is now taken.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was stated privately that the arrangement agreed to by Congress would result in a greater amount being paid for the land than was originally provided. We had rather a tentative assurance by the Representative of that district—of course, not binding—that the owner of the principal part of that land would adhere to his original proposition and accept the price and not attempt to withdraw from the original price agreed upon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The gentleman is mistaken about any tentative agreement that the owners would accept the price. When the original proposition was made to accept \$1,400,000, that proposition would have gone through because certain business men of Norfolk were practically standing behind it and practically guaranteeing that the Government might have the property at that price, but there was no such understanding when that proposition was declined.

Mr. STAFFORD. When Congress changed the terms so as to allow the Government to commandeer immediately, did the commercial interests or any other interests withdraw from

their part of the understanding, throw up their hands, and say, "Now Congress has determined another course, we will not assist to get the property at the original figures."

Mr. HOLLAND. The people are willing that the Government should have the property at a reasonable and proper figure.

Mr. FLOOD. All that was discussed on the floor was that when the offer made by the people was not accepted, then it in all probability would be thrown into court. Certain owners of a part of this property were not disposed to accept the amount offered for it as a whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. The owners of what part of the property? Were they the owners that had purchased the original site of the exposition grounds and the owners of the larger part?

Mr. FLOOD. No; the owners that we were talking about were the owners of the small lots, little dwelling houses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, of course I would not rise to criticize the action of any small owner, but I understood that the owners of the larger tracts were desirous of getting rid of their holdings, and what I want to know is whether they adhere to a gentleman's agreement and allowed the property to be handed over to the Government.

Mr. FLOOD. There was absolutely no gentleman's agreement. They offered the property at so much, and the Government declined to take it and instituted another method of procedure.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I recall, the Government appropriated sufficient money to pay them for the property at that figure?

Mr. FLOOD. Not at that figure. It was \$1,250,000, not \$1,400,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman from Virginia give the House any information as to how much of that original tract is now in possession of the Government by purchase from the owners?

Mr. FLOOD. No.

Mr. SHERLEY. I can give the gentleman the information. Seventeen claimants to property in the Pine Beach tract have formally advised of their rejection of the valuation on the property claimed by them. The valuation of the property claimed by these 17 parties as found by the board amounts to \$205,865. Five claimants within the exposition site tract have formally advised the board of their rejection of the value placed on their property. The total value found for the property held by these five parties amounts to \$465,586. The total amount of the awards to these 22 claimants that have formally rejected the values found for their property amounts to \$671,451.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give us the total amount of the awards by the board of all of the property?

Mr. SHERLEY. This may answer the gentleman's inquiry. Assuming that all of the claimants other than these 22 will finally accept the valuation found for this property, it will amount to a payment to them of \$751,454, which amount, added to the \$503,588.25, will make the total amount necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of \$1,255,072.25.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the substituted provision of the House reducing the original authorization from \$1,400,000 to \$1,200,000 is a saving to the Government of in the neighborhood of \$150,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. The amount that I have read will be the amount necessary to pay upon the basis of the acceptance of the three-fourths—75 per cent. They then go into court, and if they obtain a greater sum than the award, the amount may run over \$1,400,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the total awards for the 22 claimants is \$671,000, or is that merely the 75 per cent of their award?

Mr. SHERLEY. The total amount awarded is \$1,422,935. That is \$22,935 more than the agreement contemplated paying under that first arrangement.

Mr. STAFFORD. And with the risk of an additional allowance being awarded by the court?

Mr. SHERLEY. In case they succeed in the court in getting amounts greater than the awards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word with the intention of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I notice there is an appropriation of \$2,750,000 for

hospital construction. I would like to know how much of that will be expended or is intended to be expended for hospitals at the Great Lakes station?

Mr. SHERLEY. It has all been expended. Seven hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars of it went to Chicago.

Mr. SABATH. Has this all been expended?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; this is to take care of deficiencies.

Mr. SABATH. All of it?

Mr. SHERLEY. All of it.

Mr. SABATH. I do it because I am informed that between 55 and 60 per cent of the enlistments are made down there for the Navy, and I notice they have from 25,000 to 35,000 men stationed there most of the time, and they need a great deal of room.

Mr. SHERLEY. There has been considerable increase in bed capacity on the part of the Navy hospitals, and this is to pay the bills.

Mr. SABATH. That is all right.

The Clerk read as follows:

The total limit of cost of the five Coast Guard cruising cutters, fixed at \$2,250,000 by the naval appropriation act approved March 4, 1917, is increased to \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy the most rapid and economical construction of the foregoing vessels can be obtained thereby, he may contract, within the limit of cost herein named, for the construction of said vessels upon the basis of actual cost plus a reasonable profit to be determined by him.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What progress has been made, if the chairman knows, in the construction of these Coast Guard cutters?

Mr. SHERLEY. None. No work has been done and no work could be done on the kind of cutters they now want within the limit of cost now fixed. So they came and asked for an increase, to enable them to get cutters of a little bit wider beam, I think, and greater length, in order that they might be more seaworthy and carry heavier armament and be of greater value in connection with their use as patrol boats, and so forth. I will say to the gentleman that the committee went rather exhaustively into one phase of this matter. There seemed some question as to whether we should be appropriating money for additional Coast Guard cutters at a time when there was an apparent scarcity in yards and in labor in connection with the building of ships. It was insisted, however, both by the Coast Guard Service and the Navy, that we could have these ships built in yards not now being used and that would not be otherwise used in connection with any of the shipbuilding program, and they felt that it could be done without interfering with the labor supply; that these ships represented a type that was badly needed, and they urged both from the standpoint of the Coast Guard Service and the standpoint of the Navy's need in connection with the war maneuvers that the ships be authorized, and the committee finally acquiesced in their recommendations.

Mr. MADDEN. One of the reasons why I rose to inquire about this item was that, if I recall, a year ago when these boats were originally appropriated for it was indicated there was urgent need for their immediate construction, and I was rather curious to know why we waited a year before we began the construction of any of the boats then authorized.

Mr. SHERLEY. They said they could not get the work done for the money. This is the second time we have increased the limit of cost.

Mr. MADDEN. Could they not have started part without starting all?

Mr. SHERLEY. Except each one had to be built within a certain amount, and the amount was too small.

Mr. MADDEN. I see.

The Clerk read as follows:

Midshipmen's store fund (reimbursable): The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to advance to the midshipmen's store fund at the Naval Academy the sum of \$50,000 under "General account of advances," said sum to be used for the purchase of stores and to be accounted for in the same manner as is provided for the midshipmen's store fund in the act approved May 13, 1908, and to be repaid into the Treasury not later than December 31, 1919.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does this item mean we are running a farm down here somewhere in Maryland for the purpose of furnishing milk for the midshipmen at Annapolis, at the Naval Academy?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is the situation.

Mr. MADDEN. And the farm is being run as a distinct institution separate and apart from the Naval Academy, and all the supplies that are raised on that farm, including milk, are sent to the Naval Academy and to no other place?

Mr. SHERLEY. They have a dairy herd there that they have been maintaining for the purpose of supplying the academy with milk, and the very great increase in the number of midshipmen at the academy, and also a desire to somewhat enlarge the herd at this time, made it desirable that they obtain

this sum of money which is reimbursable out of the midshipmen's store fund, which fund was not now large enough to permit this draft to be made upon it at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. So, as a matter of fact, the midshipmen's store fund will be chargeable with the amount of this appropriation in any event?

Mr. SHERLEY. It will be, and the result of this action is simply to permit the money to be advanced.

Mr. MADDEN. It is simply an advance?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support of Indian day, boarding, and industrial schools, in addition to the general and specific appropriations made for that purpose in the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended upon improvements or used to increase the compensation of employees: *Provided further*, That except for pay for superintendents and for transportation of goods and supplies and transportation of pupils, not more than \$200 shall be expended from appropriations made in this act for the annual support and education of any one pupil in any Indian school, unless the attendance in any school shall be less than 100 pupils, in which case the Secretary of the Interior may authorize a per capita expenditure not to exceed \$225: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated for the support of such school shall not be exceeded: *Provided further*, That the number of pupils in any school entitled to the per capita allowance hereby provided for shall be determined by taking the average attendance for the entire fiscal year and not any fractional part thereof.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MADDEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph beginning on line 8, page 67. There is much of it subject to the point of order, and if this item is justified it ought to stay in and ought not to go out on a point of order. Therefore I have raised the question directly as to the merits of the proposition. The question was presented to the Committee on Indian Affairs, but no information that would justify such an appropriation was submitted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I would like to know whether or not the Committee on Appropriations had specific information justifying this appropriation?

Mr. SHERLEY. We would not have made it if we did not think so. It came before the committee by virtue of a direct reference, which is to be found in House Document No. 721, to prevent the Indian schools from being closed up this winter.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was there a showing made of the amount necessary for the support of any school?

Mr. SHERLEY. A detail of it was not made in all instances because of a lack of time to obtain the information. It was made as to a number and as to the rest it was safeguarded by the language which was put in this bill which would prevent the money for keeping the schools open from being used for the purpose of increasing salaries or for other purposes that might be questionable. Now, the sole purpose of this fund, and the sole purpose that it can be used for, is in connection with the maintenance of schools as they are now being run. If the gentleman thinks we ought to permit Indian schools to be closed and the Indian children to be sent home at this time, why, his motion is right.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not think so. I do not think the Congress or the Committee on Indian Affairs or this committee should permit any Indian schools to close for want of sufficient funds to maintain them, but I do believe that when a department asks for money upon a statement that it is needed to continue a school for the remainder of the fiscal year that they should state exactly how much they require for that particular school before getting the appropriation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, I agree with the gentleman, but at the same time I do not want the Indian children to suffer by virtue of our failure to act. For instance, I notice that at the Haskell Institute in Kansas there is \$18,000 needed in order to enable that school to continue.

Now, I submit to the gentleman that even if we did not have all the detailed information that we ought to have and that we would like to have, and had not safeguarded the funds the way we have, we are warranted in appropriating money in order that the school in Kansas shall not close and those Indian children shall not be taken out of school.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am glad the gentleman mentioned the Haskell School in Kansas. I would take the responsibility as a Member of this House, a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs; and as a citizen of the State of Kansas, and interested in the Indians, of stating to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that Haskell will not close if this bill does not include the item referred to.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be, but even notwithstanding—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And the pupils there will not suffer and the school will not suffer.

Mr. SHERLEY. Notwithstanding the gentleman's generous willingness to assume responsibility, I still insist that Congress would not be warranted, in view of the representations made before the committee in reference to appropriating some moneys. We diligently tried to get all the information possible, and I do not mean in anything I am saying to excuse the Indian Department for not being in a position to afford more information than they have. But in the last analysis we are faced with a situation which, on the basis of the best evidence that we could obtain, is this: That without this money being voted these schools, most of them, will have to close. Now, we safeguarded the fund and prevented it from being used, under the guise of that need, for other school purposes. For Congress not to vote the money seems to me would be to do an inexcusable thing.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Could any bureau representing any department in Washington make a blanket covering of that sort for a claim unsupported by any details and get away with it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; they could.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And get away with it? If all of the committees were as generous as the gentleman from Kentucky now appears—

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, they could not get away with it. The gentleman from Kansas will distinguish between matters relating to teaching of children in schools and other matters that might simply relate to routine of departments in importance.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not this item take care of the situation which was mentioned the other day by the gentleman from one of the Dakotas [Mr. NORRIS] when he called attention to the fact that several of these schools would be obliged to discontinue?

Mr. SHERLEY. There has been tremendous pressure brought to bear upon the committee by Members of the House touching this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What I want is information. I have no objection to this if it has merit.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] came to the committee and wrote us touching the matter. There were any number of gentlemen that pressed the matter and from their representations the committee was forced to believe that these schools would be closed if the moneys were not appropriated. We did our best. We held this bill for sometime trying to get all the detailed information that we thought we ought to have from the Indian Commissioner. But the failure to get it would not have justified us in simply ignoring the item as a whole. We have safeguarded it by the language that is contained in the paragraph.

Now, the proposition is plainly before the committee. If they feel because of a desire to punish somebody that may not have been as efficient in the management of these matters as they should be that they should shut off these schools, this is the way to do it. But I am more concerned in the Indian children than I am in taking a slap at the Indian Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not basing this inquiry upon the inefficiency of the Indian Department, although I do think the Indian Bureau ought not to have supported a claim like this without some detailed information.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not quarreling with that statement, but I am dealing with the facts.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And I do not believe that the school referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky, at Haskell, would be closed if this bill were not to carry this item.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman is sure of his facts and wants to reduce this amount by \$18,000, so as to exclude that sum for the Haskell School, I shall not object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But the appropriation is not itemized.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is. We have got that item in the very statement that was presented to the House—House Document No. 721. And I repeat, if the gentleman desires to reduce the item by \$18,000, on his assurance to the House that he has the personal knowledge it is not needed for the Haskell Institute, I will not object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have the belief that it is not needed by the Haskell Institute.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, it is up to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. I hope as soon as this matter is finished to move that the committee rise.

Mr. MADDEN. That was what I was going to ask.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will ask for a vote on the amendment, and then we will rise.

The CHAIRMAN. To how much of the paragraph does the gentleman direct his motion to strike out?

Mr. MADDEN. His motion is to strike it all out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] moves to strike out the paragraph. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints Mr. BARNHART, of Indiana, to preside to-morrow.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT FEBRUARY 11, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The message that the President read to the House last Monday by inadvertence was not referred to any committee. It is now referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT CALENDAR.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order making next Monday unanimous-consent day be dispensed with.

Mr. GILLET. I understand this bill will not take probably the whole day, and unanimous-consent business, I think, ought to be provided for. If there is a balance of the day they should have it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am perfectly willing to put my unanimous-consent request in this form: That this bill be the order for Monday, and upon its conclusion, if it shall be then concluded, the remainder of the day be devoted to the Unanimous-Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the pending bill shall have the right of way on Monday, notwithstanding Unanimous-Consent Calendar, and so forth, or as much of Monday as is required to finish this bill, and if there is any time left over it will return to the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ascertain if possible whether an agreement can be reached as to the time of adjournment on Monday. We might run along on this bill to half past 4 and the remainder of the day would be a very inadequate time to devote to the Unanimous Consent Calendar, not amounting to more than an hour or to a half hour.

Mr. SHERLEY. I expected to finish this bill to-day, and under normal circumstances we would have finished it; but other matters came up. But I think we ought to be able to dispose of this bill on Monday in two or three hours.

Mr. STAFFORD. The discussion of the bill might be prolonged.

Mr. CANNON. We can adjourn at any time Monday.

Mr. SHERLEY. If we do not get unanimous consent, then we can provide another day. We have got to push along bills now if we are not to get into a jam later on. I think the committee ought to bear in mind that the very thing that all of us want to avoid—a late adjournment—is going to be absolutely certain unless we get these supply bills over to the Senate speedily.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to this bill taking precedence of the regular order of business on Monday. The only question in my mind is the feasibility of making the order that the rest of the day, which may be only an hour, shall be taken up by the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I would rather have a full day given over to that business. But I will withdraw my objection to his request, in view of the gentleman's statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his objection, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order previously made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 17, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the State Department for the relief and protection of American seamen for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 937); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the State Department for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 938); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries of draftsmen in the Bureau of Ordnance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 939); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 9926) to enable the Post Office Department to bond its officers and employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9927) to provide for the construction of a waterway from the Ohio River to Lake Erie; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9928) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 9929) to repair, remodel, and modernize the public building at Providence, R. I., known as the old post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9930) increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 9931) to amend the Judicial Code to permit appeals and writs of error from orders refusing to remand cases to State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9932) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 9933) requiring the incorporation of eleemosynary societies and associations, or persons not organized as societies and associations when soliciting money for charitable aims and purposes in the Nation at large, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9934) authorizing a right of way for the transportation of water for improvement of grazing and the development of the live-stock industry upon public and national forest lands in Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9935) granting an increase of pension to George W. McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9936) granting an increase of pension to Riley Wiggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting an increase of pension to John Hagaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9938) granting a pension to Mary A. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 9939) granting a pension to Annie Ridgeway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9940) granting an increase of pension to David L. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 9941) to correct the military record of Second Lieut. Van Buren S. Reber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9942) granting a pension to Denver Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 9943) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Masson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 9944) granting an increase of pension to James Wakefield Carver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9945) granting a pension to Edward A. Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 9946) granting a pension to Mary A. Blake; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9947) granting an increase of pension to Burton M. Goins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9948) granting a pension to John T. De Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9949) granting an increase of pension to Henry Merida; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9950) granting an increase of pension to Rufus C. Davidson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 9951) for the relief of A. H. Holloway; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTON: A bill (H. R. 9952) granting an increase of pension to Albert N. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9953) granting a pension to John C. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9954) granting an increase of pension to Chester E. Kyte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of Company B. Irish Volunteers, thanking Miss RANKIN for her efforts in behalf of Ireland, and urging Members of Congress to vote for the Rankin resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the formation of an osteopathic corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Stockport, Ohio, urging the increase of pensions of Civil War veterans to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), resolution of the Association of National Advertisers (Inc.), asking for the repeal of the zonal scheme of periodical postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Montour Presbyterian Church, Oakdale, Pa., urging the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the letter carriers and many other citizens of Duquesne, Pa., favoring increased salaries to postal employees and urging the passage of the Madden bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of H. M. McLarin, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, opposing the Borland eight-hour amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Community Association of Crawfordsville, Ind., and the Woman's Club, Beaver Dam, Wis., asking for the repeal of the periodical postage amendment of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Slovak League, Local Branch No. 20, and the petition of George Filipek, Cudahy, Wis., asking for the formation of an independent Czecho-Slovak State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the New York State Forestry Association, favoring S. 3344, establishing an adequate plant quarantine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Russell S. Fowler, M. D., Brooklyn, N. Y., and resolutions of the Brooklyn Surgical Society, urging the passage of Senate bill 3748 or House bill 9563, advancing the rank of medical officers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution of Post 84, Veterans of Foreign Wars, concerning pension increase for veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, concerning the liberation of the Bohemians and Slovaks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, concerning Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of H. M. McLarin, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, opposing the Borland eight-hour amendment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Dover, N. J., for the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New York Antivivisection Society, opposing the compulsory inoculation of soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of Julia D. Ferris, of Denver, Colo., urging the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Snowy Range Lodge, No. 30, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, urging the Congress to refrain from action on legislation designed to place men engaged in transportation service under Federal workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MERRITT: Evidence to accompany House bill 9917, granting a pension to Stephen K. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Erlanger, Ky., and vicinity, asking Congress to provide for the appointment of a chaplain for every 1,200 men in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Woman's Committee of the Council of National Defense, for planting tobacco lands in food-stuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Meriden (Conn.) War Bureau, in favor of resolution for drafting of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 17, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BAENHART].

Rev. George Robinson, D. D., chaplain United States Army, retired, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. Who hast set Thy glory above the heavens.

When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers; the moon and stars which Thou hast ordained: What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands. Thou hast put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen, and the beasts of the field; the fowls of the air and the fish of the sea.

But Thou hast not only thus been mindful of man in his creation, but Thou hast been wonderfully mindful of him in his redemption! Not with silver and gold, not with all the mines of earth or the depths of every sea, could one soul of man be redeemed. The price of man's redemption must be taken from off the throne of God itself, the gift of His only begotten and well beloved Son, to become incarnate, and by a death shameful and cruel at the hands of men He came to save, atone for our sins.

O Lord, our God, we thank Thee for the life of this man in whose memory this service is held; for his devotion to his country, in his young manhood following the flag and offering his life to help to save the life and integrity of the Nation; for his service in the enactment of laws in State and national legislatures, and the interpretation and application of the laws of the land in a judicial position. May the memory of these services for his fellow men be a solace to the dear ones who most greatly mourn his loss as husband and father, and may the loving, pitying One speak the words of comfort to their hearts which no human voice can speak.

Again, in this hour of sorrow, would we lift our hearts in behalf of the land we so ardently love. O Lord Jesus, when Thou wert approaching Thy Gethsemane and Thy Calvary, Thou didst pray, "Father, save me from this hour!" So thousands of hearts in this land have prayed that our country might be

saved from this time of trial. But Thou, O Christ, in submission to the divine will, didst immediately add "But for this cause came I unto this hour." So it may be that for this cause, the cause of truth, of righteousness, and the true liberties of the nations of the earth, our Nation in the fulness of its prosperity has come to this time. And as Thou didst further pray "Father, glorify the name," so we believe that we have a right to pray Father in heaven, make this Nation glorious in the great cause to which it has set itself; that it may help to soon bring again to this troubled earth a peace which shall be founded on righteousness and truth, and justice for all that dwell on the earth.

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the Journal. Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the special order for this service.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE COMSTOCK, OF INDIANA.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. DIXON, by unanimous consent, Ordered, That Sunday, February 17, 1918, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. DANIEL W. COMSTOCK, late a Representative from the State of Indiana.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 251.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. DANIEL W. COMSTOCK, late a Member of this House from the State of Indiana.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken and the resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ELLIOTT, the successor of the deceased.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of sorrow and tribulation, when the world is on fire and we are daily called upon to witness scenes of carnage and suffering such as the world has never before been called to look upon, it is hard for us to realize, living as we do so far from the scene of conflict, what this war means to this world. It is impossible for us to conceive of the untold suffering which war brings to the nations which are engaged in it. Men who have gone through the terrible scourge of fire and blood and endured hardships and the sufferings of the late Civil War can, perhaps, in a measure, realize what it all means.

While we are now most intensely interested in the daily reports of the present war and are engaged with our own troubles connected with the terrible conflict now raging in Europe, we should not forget that we, as a nation, owe a debt of gratitude to the veterans of the Civil War which we can never repay. But while this is true it is our duty to do what we can while the few survivors are living to lighten their burdens and make their pathways brighter, sweeter, and happier; and as they one by one pass to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler ever returns, it is our duty and our pleasure to render to their memories that measure of love and respect which their service to our country so richly entitles them to receive.

It is, therefore, a privilege and an honor to-day to pay this last small tribute of our love and esteem to the memory of a distinguished citizen of my native State, my friend and predecessor in this House.

The sixth congressional district of Indiana has produced some very distinguished and honorable statesmen in its day, among them Oliver P. Morton, the great war governor, who was one of President Lincoln's staunchest supporters, and whose bust now adorns the Hall of Fame adjacent to this Chamber. It has from time to time been represented in this honorable body by men whose fame was as wide as the Nation, and none was more beloved and respected in the community in which he lived than DANIEL WEBSTER COMSTOCK. His early life was not spent in luxurious ease; but he, like thousands of our best men, was brought up to work for his livelihood under the honest and frugal discipline which prevailed in the homes of the good old